

[Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar] [25th January 1928]

re-arrangement and adoption of the form prevailing in the Legislative Assembly. And I may also assure the hon. Member that it is not intended to introduce any serious deviation from the practice hitherto prevailing with regard to the procedure applicable to the introduction and discussion of Bills."

Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar rose to speak.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member has no chance to reply."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Sir, we have been assured by the hon. the Advocate-General that no material deviation is made by the introduction of the new Standing Order. But I see that the old Standing Order provides for a general discussion of the principle of the Bill and I do not see any such provision made in the new one, but it provides for a future date."

Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—"I draw the attention of the hon. Member to Standing Order No. 38 (2) printed on the next page of the report circulated to hon. Members."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"I accept it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that clause (2) of Standing Order No. 37 be adopted."

The motion was carried.

STANDING ORDER NO. 38.

Clause (1).

11-30
a.m.

* Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I am afraid the Advocate-General has not clearly explained what I wanted to know on a former occasion. At present there are four stages and I want to know whether it is the intention of the Advocate-General to make it into five stages. If that is the idea and if the Advocate-General says that there is no material alteration, I have no objection to the amendment; let there be as many stages as possible."

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—"Sir, what my hon. Friend refers to as two stages under Standing Order No. 38 are really speaking only one stage. One of three motions under Standing Order No. 38 will be passed or negated at the end of the discussion under clause 2 and that is only one stage."

The question that clause (1) of Standing Order No. 38 be adopted was put to the House and carried.

Clause (2).

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Standing Order No. 38 (2) is for the discussion of the House."

The question that clause (2) of Standing Order No. 38 be adopted was put to the House and carried.

STANDING ORDER NO. 39.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Standing Order No. 39 is for the discussion of the House."

The question that Standing Order No. 39 be adopted was put to the House and carried.

25th January 1928]

STANDING ORDER No. 40.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The question that Standing Order No. 40 be omitted is for the discussion of the House.”

The question that Standing Order No. 40 be deleted was put to the House and negatived. The Standing Order was therefore retained.

STANDING ORDER No. 53.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Standing Order No. 53 as reported on by the Select Committee is for the discussion of the House.”

The question was put to the House and adopted.

STANDING ORDER No. 66-A.

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—“ Sir, in Standing Order No. 66-A as reported on by the Select Committee, I move that for the words ‘ on some day ’ substitute the words ‘ on a day ’.”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ I second it.”

The amendment was put to the House and adopted.

The clause as amended was then put to the House and adopted.

STANDING ORDER No. 66-B.

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—“ Sir, I move that in Standing Order No. 66-B for the words ‘ motions for . . . item in a grant ’ the following words be substituted: ‘ Motions for the reduction of any grant or for the omission or reduction of any item in a grant ’.”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ I second it.”

The amendment was put to the House and adopted.

Standing Order No. 66-B as amended was put to the House and adopted.

STANDING ORDERS Nos. 66-C AND 66-D.

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—“ I move, Sir, that Standing Order No. 66-C be numbered as 66-D and Standing Order No. 66-D be numbered as 66-C.”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ I second it.”

The amendment was put to the House and adopted.

* Mr. T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRIYAR :—“ Sir, for Standing Order No. 66-D as thus renumbered, I move that the following may be substituted :—

‘ Motions for the reduction of any further grant or supplementary grant or for the omission or reduction of any item in a further grant or a supplementary grant may be admitted by the President subject to such notice as he thinks fit. ’

“ This amendment is necessary in view of the fact that notice of amendments referred to in this clause cannot be as much as is required for ordinary amendments.”

The amendment was put to the House and adopted.

[25th January 1928]

V

DISAPPROVAL OF THE APPOINTMENT OF THE STATUTORY COMMISSION.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The House will now resume the discussion on Resolution No. 20. The amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar is now for the consideration of the House.”

* Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—“ Sir, though many of us are in favour of the amendments to be moved hereafter by my hon. friends Messrs. Udayar and Krishnan Nayar, we cannot but recognize that there is a strong feeling in the House that this resolution disapproving the constitution of the Statutory Commission should be passed in some form or other. The resentment felt at the constitution of the Commission has been made manifest by the resolutions passed at the various conferences held during the Christmas week and afterwards. Leaders of the various political parties, not merely the Extremists, but also the Moderates, men who have co-operated in working the Reforms including even those who have been in the inner counsels of the Government, such as Ex-Ministers, Ex-Members of the Executive Council—men who differ as widely in their political principles, such as Mr. Jinnah, Sir Abdur Rahim and Dr. Ansari among Muslims and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sir T. B. Sapru, Pandit Motilal Nehru and Sir P. S. Sivaswami Ayyar among Hindus have joined in a movement for the boycott of this Commission”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am afraid the hon. Member is discussing the general merits of the resolution. The amendment of Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar is now for the consideration of the House. His amendment is to add the words ‘ as it is at present constituted ’ to the amendment of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. The question now is whether these words may be added to the amendment of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. Those who want to speak on the main motion are requested to reserve their remarks to a future occasion ; because once they exhaust themselves they will not be able to do justice later on. Moreover such remarks will not be relevant to the amendment now under consideration. I request hon. Members to confine themselves to the question whether these words ought to be added or not.”

11-45
a.m.

* Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—“ The difference between the amendment of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti and that of Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar is this. The Congress Party do not want a Commission of any sort to be appointed by the British Parliament ; they want a Round Table Conference to be called here. But the other parties that have declared a boycott are against the Commission only as it is constituted at present. The amendment proposed by Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar seeks to make this difference clear.

“ There is a large section of opinion in this country which is prepared to co-operate with the Commission provided certain conditions are fulfilled. They are against the procedure as it is now laid down. There is one way still left open to the Government for conciliating Indian opposition. The position taken up by Mr. Jayakar and his party, the resolution passed at the Executive Committee meeting of the Justicites and the attitude of a large number of other people leave room for Sir George Simon to so modify the procedure of the Commission as to placate a considerable body of the opposition. There is a large section of opinion which feels that the mere exclusion

25th January 1928]

[Mr. A. B. Shetty]

of Indians is not what is so objectionable as the inferior position assigned to the committees of our Legislatures and the denial to our representatives of any effective share in determining the future constitution of this country. Direct representation on the Commission would serve no useful purpose if the right sort of Indians are not appointed on it. Therefore, they say 'Never-mind if we are excluded from the Commission; but give to the Committees of our Legislatures equal powers, rights and opportunities with the Members of the Commission'. The Labour Party leaders have urged the same thing in Parliament. But the statement made by the Premier in November last, as well as the communiqué issued by the Viceroy, do not give us any ground for hoping that the Indian Committees will be anything more than mere witnesses. It is true that Lord Birkenhead, speaking a fortnight later, said that there was no reason to assume that the Indian Committees would have to appear merely as witnesses before the Commission. They were, he said, invited to co-operate as colleagues."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am afraid the hon. Member is not in order."

* Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—" I am showing how the Commission as at present constituted does not meet with our approval."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have come to the conclusion that the hon. Member is not in order."

* Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I am in entire accord with the first portion of the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar, inasmuch as it reproduces word for word the amendment of the Leader of our party, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. But I take exception to the words 'as it is at present constituted'. If I understand his amendment aright, there are two sides to it. If I may say so, it has a positive element and also a negative element. The positive element consists in the addition of the words 'as it is at present constituted'. The negative element which is to be implied consists in his seeking to omit the following words we come across in the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, after the words 'Statutory Commission':—

'Inasmuch as its constitution ignores the National demand for self-determination and insults the self-respect of the Indian people.'

"I shall deal now with the positive aspect of the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar, regarding the addition of the words 'as it is at present constituted'. I fail to understand and it is impossible for me to know exactly what is at the back of his mind when he made up his mind to have those words. We have only one Commission, a Commission in the shaping of which we had absolutely no voice. We never asked, for a Commission; we were never consulted. Behind our back, without consulting us and without taking us into confidence, the Commission has been ushered into being and thrust upon us. Therefore there is no question of our boycotting other commissions. The only Commission which we are called upon to consider and which is likely to function in the immediate future is the Simon Commission and we are only concerned with its present constitution. Whatever the future constitution may be, we need not trouble ourselves with it now. When modification comes there will be time enough

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[25th January 1928]

for us to deal with it then. Sir, these words are, to my mind, elusive words ; these words take us nowhere. As I construe these words ' as it is at present constituted ' it gives room to some suspicion, to some misapprehension in the minds of some persons that, in the event of Lord Birkenhead climbing down to the extent of modifying the constitution of the Commission, of granting some concessions, making some declarations here and there and giving us some assurance which some hon. Members want, there will be a tendency, inclination and liking on the part of some Members of this House, on the part of my hon. Friend Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar and others of his way of thinking to sink their differences and to make up their minds to co-operate with the Commission. But so far as we are concerned, our resolve is firm ; our resolve is absolute. But so far as my hon. Friend's amendment is concerned it seems to look forward to the possibility of some contingency arising—probably it may be a distant dream in his mind—which may smoothen all the differences and enable him and some hon. Members of his party to make up their minds to co-operate with the Commission.

" Now, Sir, coming to the other aspect of the amendment I am not able to understand what is the object of my hon. Friend in omitting the words ' inasmuch as its constitution ignores the National demand for self-determination and insults the self-respect of the Indian people.' Can any Member of this hon. House, can any person outside this House say that this Commission is not a negation of the principle of self-determination about which we heard so much during the time of the Great War ? So far as we are concerned, we claim our right to settle and determine a constitution for ourselves and we have resolved not to take any constitution which may be offered to us without taking us into confidence and without our being given a free hand in shaping the destiny of our country. We regard swaraj as our birth-right and we shall have nothing to do with any Commission which seeks to ignore us altogether, which seeks to boycott us ; so long as Great Britain is boycotting us it has no business to expect us to co-operate ; we are entitled to return boycott for boycott.

" Then, Sir, can anybody say that this Commission is not a direct insult to us ? What right has one nation to frame a constitution for another, however sympathetic it may be or it may pretend to be. We know our needs and requirements best and ours should be the final determining and decisive voice in the shaping of the constitution of the future. I beseech, I implore, in the name of the 33 crores of devas and 48 thousand rishis, I make an earnest and enthusiastic appeal to every Indian who has a spark of patriotism in him, to every Indian with self-respect, to every Indian who has thirst for swaraj, to every man who is anxious to take his proper place in the councils of his empire to vindicate the honour and self-respect of the nation. By the word ' Indian ' I have no desire to exclude Anglo-Indians. I clearly include by the word Anglo-Indians who have made this country the abode of their domicile, the Anglo-Indians who have remained in this country who care for our welfare and who are in this country eating its salt. A stage will be reached in the fight for freedom which does not admit of any mental reservation. We have arranged for hartals all over the country"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member may take another opportunity to address the Council on hartals. He must confine his remarks now to the words of the amendment."

25th January 1928]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The relevancy arises in this way that it has a bearing upon making our mind in favour of the resolution of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti and against the inclusion of certain words."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar alone is for the discussion of the House."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, the words 'as it is at present constituted' may make some of them waver and may not enable some of them to take an active part in the boycott of the Commission upon which we have set our heart. It is in that way that my remarks become relevant. I implore my hon. Friend Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar to make up his mind to withdraw his amendment as it is likely to embarrass some of us however much he may be inclined to sympathise with us. His intentions may be very good; it is no doubt that he is a true patriot; and that he is anxious to go along with us. But he wants to cry halt. I appeal to him and I implore him to go along with us and not to cry halt."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, I wish to say a few words on this amendment. It appears to me that it adds nothing to the resolution to which it is proposed to be added. To say 'the Commission as it is at present constituted' is merely to paraphrase the words 'the Commission'. The amendment adds nothing and it seems to me to convey the same idea, whatever may be the mental reservations behind it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is to add the words 'as it is at present constituted' at the end of the amendment of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti."

The amendment was put to the House and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

12
noon

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. A. B. Shetty. | 24. Mr. C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 2. " J. Kuppuswami. | 25. " M. Narayana Rao. |
| 3. " R. Nagan Gowda. | 26. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| 4. " T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 27. " A. Parasurama Rao Pantulu. |
| 5. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. | 28. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 6. " Ramanath Goenka. | 29. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. | 30. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 8. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 31. " L. K. Tulastiram. |
| 9. " Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. | 32. " K. R. Karant. |
| 10. " S. V. Vanavudaiya Gounder. | 33. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 11. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | 34. " K. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 12. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi. | 35. " B. Venkararatnam. |
| 13. " M. R. Seturatham Ayyar. | 36. " J. A. Sa'danba. |
| 14. " S. Satyamurti. | 37. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 38. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 16. " K. Koti Reddi. | 39. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 17. " P. C. Venkatapathi Raju. | 40. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabbapati Mudaliyar. |
| 18. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 41. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 19. Abdul Hamid Khan Bahadur. | 42. " T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 20. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 43. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 21. K. P. V. S. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur. | 44. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 22. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. | 45. " K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 23. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 4. The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir. |
| 2. " Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 5. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 6. " F. B. Evans. |
| | 7. " H. A. Watson. |

[25th January 1928]

Noes—cont.

8. Mr. G. T. Boag.
9. " A. M. C. Tampoe.
10. " S. H. Slater.
11. " C. B. Cotterell.
12. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai.
13. " R. Foulkes.
14. Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur.
15. Mr. Muppil Nayar.
16. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan
Nambudripad.

17. Mr. N. Siva Raj.
18. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva.
19. " V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
20. " K. Krishnan.
21. " S. N. Dorai Rajah.
22. " G. R. Premayya.
23. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
24. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.

Neutral.

1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogya-
swami Mudaliyar.
2. " Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
3. " Dr. P. Subbarayan.
4. Dr. (Mrs.) Muthulakshmi Reddi.
5. Mr. J. Bheemayya.
6. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
7. Mr. S. Venkayya.
8. " G. W. Chambers.
9. " H. F. P. Hearson.
10. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
11. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.

12. Mr. G. Harisarovattana Rao.
13. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
14. " S. Mutbia Mudaliyar.
15. " P. Siva Rao.
16. " C. Gopala Menon.
17. The Raja of Panagal.
18. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro, Kt.
19. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
20. " P. O. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
21. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
22. T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.

Ayes 45. Noes 24. Neutral 22.

The motion was carried.

* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, I wish to move the amendment that stands in my name. I move it in substitution of the amendment of my Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti as amended by Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. My amendment is this:

'In lines 2 to 7 for the words "the resentment of this Council . . . Legislatures of India" substitute the words "that this Council is of opinion that in the official announcement of the appointment of the Royal Commission, the status and functions of the Committees of the Legislatures are not clearly defined and that unless an authoritative declaration is made, giving the Committees of the Legislatures an effective voice in the shaping of the decisions of the Commission at all important stages, this Council cannot co-operate with the work of the Commission".'

"We have heard a great deal about the constitution itself, and this amendment of mine does not say anything about the constitution of the Commission. I may say at the outset that I generally agree with all that has been said regarding the constitution, the unsatisfactory nature of the constitution. With reference to my amendment itself, it is stated that Committees of the Central and the Provincial Legislatures will be elected; but as I understand the announcement made in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, the powers that are proposed to be given to these Committees are very indefinite and vague, and as I have tried to understand them, these Committees will be only practically, more or less, witnesses before the Simon Commission. They are not given any other power. It seems to me, Sir, that, as matters stand at present, the only course that is left to us is not to co-operate with this Commission; but I do not want to shut the doors fully against co-operation. We are prepared, Sir, under this resolution, to co-operate with them under certain circumstances, i.e., if more powers than are at present proposed to be given to these Committees of the

25th January 1928]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Legislatures, powers which in the words of this amendment the Committee will be able to exercise effectively in the different stages of the consultation of the Commission, powers which will give these Committees an effective voice in the shaping of the decisions of the Commission in all important stages be given to them. I may also say that this amendment which I am moving is one that my party has adopted outside this Council. I shall explain a little more in detail what is meant by the following words of this amendment: 'unless an authoritative declaration is made giving the Committees of the Legislature an effective voice in the shaping of the decisions of the Commission at all important stages . . .'

"If, say, the Committees that have to be appointed by these Legislatures are allowed to sit with the Commission and take part in the examination and cross-examination of witnesses that may appear before the Royal Commission, that will be giving them an effective voice or power. And then again, this is what we want. These Committees of the Legislature should be given power to see all the documents, official and non official, public, private or confidential, that may be placed before the Royal Commission by the Government of India or by the Provincial Governments. These Committees of the Legislatures, according to my amendment, must be given such powers as the Commission have for scrutinizing all the materials, documentary, or oral, confidential or otherwise, that may be placed before this Commission. Further these Committees should be given power not only to examine and cross-examine witnesses that may appear before this Commission, but the power also of suggesting the calling of additional evidence, either documentarily or otherwise, and after all this evidence is taken and is placed on record, these Committees should have the power to express their opinions and decisions on the evidence. If these powers are given to the Committees, they will be able to influence the decisions of the Commission to a very large extent. Even if my amendment be carried, there is this difficulty, namely, that ultimately, whatever powers may be given to these Committees, according to the resolution that has been adopted both by the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and under the terms of the Royal Warrant appointing this Commission, these Committees of the Legislatures will not be able to report directly to the House of Parliament. This is certainly a difficulty. It would have been better if these Committees had possessed this power also. But, however, in the present stage, as far as I can see, this is not possible unless another resolution is moved in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords. I do not think this will ever take place giving these Committees this power. However, these Committees can report their decisions to their respective Legislatures, Central or Provincial, and these Legislatures can in their turn send their decisions to the Secretary of State for the consideration of the House of Commons and the House of Lords. I dare say that the opinions of these Committees will influence the House of Commons and the House of Lords and their Standing Committees to some extent in their decisions. In any case, Sir, what I submit is this. If these Committees of the Legislatures are given the powers I have suggested, that will go a long way to minimise the discontent in the country.

"I can say further that the suggestion I have referred to was already adverted to in the House of Commons itself. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald supporting the proposition for the appointment of the Royal Commission stated that the Committee of the Indian Parliament, as he called it, must be

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar] [25th January 1928]

given all these powers. Mr. Baldwin stated that these were matters of procedure to be left to the discretion of the Simon Commission. These are matters of a far-reaching consequence and they were left to the discretion of the Simon Commission after their arrival in India. This is also what in effect was the statement of Lord Birkenhead, the Secretary of State for India, made on the day the Commission left for India. Now that the Commission has left for India, he said, let us not interfere with the procedure of the Commission in any way. The Secretary of State agrees with the Premier and says that the procedure should be left to the discretion of the Simon Commission after their arrival in India. So that, it seems to me, that neither the Premier nor the Secretary of State has shut the door for co-operation or is against our suggestion. Therefore let us not shut the door against co-operation with this Commission. If the Commission is prepared to give these powers to the Committees, then we shall co-operate; if it does not, we shall not; that is, if certain powers are granted to these Committees which will enable them effectively to influence the decision of the Commission at important stages, we shall co-operate. But as matters stand at present, it is not possible to co-operate. We tell them, well, Sirs, as matters stand at present we cannot co-operate. But, if you are prepared to accept our suggestion and give wider powers to these Committees and thus enable these Committees to do some useful work to the country, then we shall co-operate. So that I submit they will be able to see from this amendment that unless they, that is the Members of this Commission, give more powers to the Committee, the only effect will be non-co-operation. So that, it seems to me, Sir, that in these circumstances, my humble opinion which I submit is that this Council will be well advised in accepting this amendment. The other questions relating to the Commission have been debated at length in this Council and I have nothing to add to them. With these few words I commend this amendment to the acceptance of the House."

12-15
p.m.

Rao Bahadur S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR :—"I second the amendment."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is to substitute the amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar for the amendment of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti as amended by that of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. I was made to understand by Mr. P. Siva Rao that he does not propose to move his amendment. Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar wants to amend the amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar at this stage. I give him permission to move his amendment. I think hon. Members have had notice of the new amendment of which he has given notice. Yesterday I said that Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar and Mr. Siva Rao will be given an opportunity of moving their amendments as amendments to that of Mr. Krishnan Nayar. Mr. Siva Rao has now mentioned to me that he is not going to move any amendment. Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar has given notice of an amendment to amend the amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar and it has now to be moved."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I move the amendment to the amendment just now moved by my Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar :—

'In line 1 for the words "This Council" substitute the words "This Council expresses its dissatisfaction with the constitution of the Statutory Commission and further recommends . . ."

25th January 1928] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

“As my friend has substituted the word ‘unless’ in line 6, it is unnecessary for me to propose that amendment. I begin, Sir, by stating what are the grounds for this dissatisfaction with the Statutory Commission.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member need not move his second part because Mr. Krishnan Nayar has moved it in the amended form.”

* Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—“In my view the dissatisfaction does not arise from the appointment of the Commission. For although a large section of my friends raised the objection to the preamble and section 84-A regarding the Statutory Commission still at the time these were allowed to be incorporated in the Government of India Act many sections acquiesced in their passing. They never raised their voice in protest against the preamble or against the inclusion of section 84-A relating to the Statutory Commission. But, Sir, although, technically, Parliament were justified in appointing the Commission there were still three or four ways open to them. They could have told the Government of India to ask the legislatures or the political bodies and associations to formulate definite and clear proposals for the revision of the constitution or submit draft revisions of the constitution and after they were in receipt of this volume of literature they could have appointed the Commission to tour this country and conduct the necessary inquiry and examinations with the Committees associated with them. Secondly, Sir, I do not think that the dissatisfaction has arisen out of the fact that this is not a purely Indian Commission. True, some might contend that after all the Commission was not going to be supplied with more material than was available to the Muddiman Committee and that the resolutions moved in the Assembly, or the Provincial legislatures or the various political bodies were there to guide them. Even that, Sir, is not after all so very strong an argument. It reminds me of a story of three scientists, one an Englishman, one a Frenchman and the third a German, who all resolved to write a dissertation on the camel. The Frenchman went to the museum, the German buried himself in a library amid books; but the Englishman took the next steamer and went straight to the home of the camel in Arabia and wrote his dissertation after personal observation and study. There is a practical way of doing things which is far more effective, far more real and gives far greater insight into the working of institutions than merely reading the resolutions however accurately they may set down the aims and aspirations, the opinions, conventions, traditions and so on and so forth. Therefore, the Commission was quite welcome to this country. But what was to be its constitution and composition? Here, Sir, comes the chief ground of dissatisfaction, that it was not a mixed Commission and that Indian members were not appointed on that Commission. Not only that but in introducing and recommending its constitution, speeches were made, observations were made implying and exaggerating the communal differences which are, after all, petty, domestic differences, and the communal tension in the north which is more religious than political. I fail to understand why the question of communal differences was dragged in at all. I commend the honesty of British statesmen that, if they meant and believed what they said, they did not exploit those feelings to their own advantage. I am sorry that various less important considerations weighed with them but not the all-important question of consulting and respecting Indian sentiment. It cannot, indeed, be denied that some dissatisfaction would have been caused by the rejection of certain names and the

[Mr. S. Arpudawami Udayar] [25th January 1928]

selection only of certain names of prominent Indians. But then, Sir, the dissatisfaction would have been but local, of a less general character. It would have been limited to certain communities and sections of the people. It would not have become widely diffused and general as it is now. It would certainly not have united all the different political parties into one common opposition to the Commission. In other words it would not have resulted in provoking hostility where evidently no hostility was intended. It is a pity, Sir, that English statesmen so much accustomed to business methods and business habits, worshippers as they are of custom and precedent, form and rule, technicalities and formula should deprecate the value of sentiment, should show a lack of imagination and of ability to conciliate Indian sentiment. English statesmen seem to look with suspicion on sentiment, suppressing it as if it were a dangerous thing, as if it were a sign of weakness. Again, Sir, the clear object of the Statutory Commission, though not stated in so many terms, was to make an enquiry, and for this enquiry to be a success, one necessary and indispensable condition is that the Commission should come, should sit, show a clear interest in the working of the reforms, secure a thorough understanding of and a closer co-operation with the people, with the Indian people treated as equals. From the way the whole thing has been managed it appears clear that Indian opinion was not treated with consideration and offence given, though not intentionally. It is, if I may say so, a tactical blunder. Any stronger expression is not called for. Now, Sir, as regards the Justice party amendment, my hon. Friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, has entered into details. I too think, Sir, that there is a door left open and that it is better that we keep that door open. He referred to the speeches of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Lord Birkenhead. I wish to emphasize and point out the significance of the expression used by the latter, viz., that the responsibility had gone out of his hands. This means that his responsibility consisted in determining the personnel of the Commission, in introducing the Commission and in getting the sanction of the Parliament for the Commission. But as regards the method and nature of the inquiry, or as my hon. Friend remarked, the details of the procedure, they are left to the Commission, to their good will and discretion. It is certainly open to the Commission—and, I think, it is the only course open to them—to recognize the legislative committees as equal partners, to treat them as equals, to allow them to sit with them, giving them opportunities like themselves of collecting, marshalling, reviewing, selecting facts, deciding on the evidence, testing it by cross-examination or other methods and of shaping effectively the decisions arrived at by the Statutory Commission at all important stages and also of effectively shaping the draft report to be placed before the Parliament. I say, Sir, that this may very well be, and, will very probably be, the procedure adopted. Because, the mere act of the Commission coming here and asking us to interview them confers nothing, bestows no favour on the Indian people. That is no concession. It will rather widen the gulf, widen the breach, increase dissatisfaction, and if nothing more was intended, if the procedure such as the one indicated by me was not going to be adopted, I, for one, find no meaning in the Commission coming all the way to this country. Anybody is free, any association is free and any set of persons or individuals is free to make their representation to the Mother of Parliaments. They may send up their proposals to it directly. They need not necessarily place them before the Commission. This is not conferring any special right on them. The Commission will be

25th January 1928] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.]

conferring no privilege by consenting to receive deputations, by consenting to have interviews or consenting to receive memorandums or perhaps considered proposals or draft constitutions presented to them by different political bodies. A statesman like Sir John Simon is surely expected to know what he is about and having come so far and having left behind the cramping influences of Great Britain and breathing the Indian atmosphere, I think, he and the other members of the Commission will adopt the course I have suggested, the only course possible and honourable under the circumstances. He will understand that the legislative committees which are committees constituted by the provincial legislatures and the central Assembly, which, in their turn, have been brought into existence by the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms and therefore the creations of Parliament are sister bodies which should be received and given equal status and provided with every facility and every opportunity of sitting side by side with them, of going into everything with them, of shaping and effectively shaping and determining the decisions arrived at by the Statutory Commission at all important and formative stages. I believe in the possibility of a *rapprochement*, of an *entente cordiale*, of the harmonious working of both the Commission and the Legislative Committee. I want my friends to give up their attitude of *non possumus* and if a liberal gesture is made by that body, by the Commission, there must be a response from the other side, i.e., from us. In that sense, in the possibility of the pain caused by the constitution being allayed by the method of procedure, I move the amendment that stands in my name."

The ZAMINDAR OF SEITHUR :—"Sir, I have greatest pleasure in seconding the amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar." 12-30 p.m.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar is now for the discussion of the House."

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Mr. President, I regret I have to oppose this amended motion of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, as well as the previous amendment to which this is an amendment."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"It will be more convenient to dispose of first the amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar. If hon. Members want to go into the merits of the amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar, they will have to wait for a suitable opportunity. Now, I have declared that the amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar is for the discussion of the House."

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I shall take the amendment of my Friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar. It is a conditional one. That is, he expects certain conditions to be fulfilled in which case we are to co operate. Now, Sir, what guarantee is there that this condition will be fulfilled? There is absolutely no guarantee. We are hoping against hopes in expecting this condition to be fulfilled."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The latter portion of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar's amendment is not before the House. I have just now read the amendment. He wants to substitute the words 'This Council expresses its dissatisfaction with the constitution of the Statutory Commission and further' for the words 'This Council' in Mr. Krishnan Nayar's amendment."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Then I shall speak later on."

[25th January 1928]

The amendment of Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar was put to the House and declared negatived. A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogya-
swami Mudaliyar. | 17. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 2. " Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 18. Mr. K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 3. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. | 19. " U. Ramaswami Ayyar. |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 20. " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 5. Mr. A. Balakrishna Shetty. | 21. " S. Muttayya Mudaliyar |
| 6. " J. Bheemayya. | 22. " P. Siva Rao. |
| 7. " J. Kuppuswami. | 23. " C. Gopala Menon. |
| 8. " R. Nagan Gowda. | 24. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. " T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 25. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 10. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. | 26. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 11. " Rammath Goenka. | 27. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 12. " W. P. A. Soundarapandya Nalar. | 28. " T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 13. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 29. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddi-
yar. |
| 14. " Chavadi Subrahmanya Pillai. | 30. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 15. " S. V. Vanavudaya Gounder. | 31. " K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 16. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 31. Mr. P. Anjaneyalu. |
| 2. " Sir Norrin Marjoribanks. | 32. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad
Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 33. " P. C. Venkatapati Raju. |
| 4. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 34. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. |
| 5. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar. | 35. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. |
| 6. " F. B. Evans. | 36. " C. N. Mutturanga Mudaliyar. |
| 7. " H. A. Watson. | 37. " Abdul Hamid Khan. |
| 8. " G. T. Boag. | 38. " K. V. R. Swami. |
| 9. " A. M. C. Tampoe. | 39. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur. |
| 10. " S. H. Slater. | 40. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. |
| 11. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 41. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. |
| 12. " R. Foulkes. | 42. Mr. M. Narayana Rao. |
| 13. " Muppil Nayar. | 43. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| 14. Rao Bahadur O. M. Nerayana Nampudiri-
pad. | 44. " A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 15. Mr. N. Sivaraj. | 45. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 16. " M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | 46. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 47. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsala Nayudu. |
| 18. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 48. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 19. " C. E. Wood. | 49. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 20. " J. Mackenzie Smith. | 50. " K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| 21. " G. W. Chambers. | 51. " L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 22. " H. F. P. Hearson. | 52. " K. R. Karant. |
| 23. " S. N. Dorai Raja. | 53. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 24. " G. R. Premayya. | 54. " K. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 25. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. | 55. " B. Venkataratnam. |
| 26. Rao Sahib K. Srinivasan. | 56. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 27. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 57. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 28. " S. Satyamurti. | 58. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati
Mudaliyar. |
| 29. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 59. Muhammad Kadir Meideen Sahib
Bahadur. |
| 30. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | |

Ayes 31. Noes 59.

The amendment was lost.

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—" Mr. President, Sir, now that the table has been cleared of all conflicting amendments, the issue before the House is clear and simple: Does the House want to express its want of confidence in the Simon Commission as it is at present constituted, and say it will have nothing to do with it, or does it propose to plough the sands and request people to change their minds who have already made up their minds and will not change their minds, when we know full well, unless we are misguided dupes,

25th January 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

that these conditions cannot be satisfied? What does the amendment of my Friend, the floor leader of the Justice Party, on whose general adherence to the boycott of the Simon Commission I should like to offer them my humble and sincere congratulations, amount to? I should like to know from my hon. Friend whether he sincerely believes, after reading the speeches of the Secretary of State, the statement of the Viceroy, the letter of Sir John Simon to his constituents, and last but not least, the Royal Warrant of appointment of this Commission, as a distinguished lawyer, as an experienced public man, as the leader of a party and as a statesman, His Majesty's Government, with its present Conservative majority in the House of Commons, with the acquiescence in the matter by the Labour Party, which does not know its own mind, or if it does, does not care to assert itself for the sake of a subject nation, will satisfy these conditions? What does he want? He wants that the committees of the legislatures be given an effective voice in the shaping of the decisions of the Commission at all important stages. I ask my Friend whether he does not remember section 84-A of the Government of India Act under which this Commission is appointed. This Commission has got a statutory right and a statutory duty to report to the Houses of Parliament. Can this Commission share the decision of important issues coming before them with any other body? Is it possible by statute or by common sense to compel any statutory body to share the responsibility for its own decision with any other body? There is no use playing with words, and imagining you can get something. Of course, as for the hon. Members who have made up their minds to co-operate with the Commission on some plausible excuse or other, it is impossible to argue with them. But I want my friends to read the facts. I really want to draw their rapid attention to a few important statements made by authoritative persons, which place the position of these committees beyond any ambiguity. The status and functions of these committees of legislatures have been very clearly defined and I will enumerate them chronologically. The first statement is the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy. He said:

'His Majesty's Government cannot, of course, dictate to the Commission what procedure it shall follow, but they are of opinion that its task *in taking evidence* (mark the words 'in taking evidence') would be greatly facilitated if it were to invite the Central Legislature to appoint a joint select committee chosen from its elected and nominated unofficial members which would draw up its view and proposals in writing and lay them before the Commission for examination in such manner as the latter may decide, (i.e., as the Commission may decide). This committee might remain in being for any consultation which the Commission may desire at subsequent stages of the enquiry. It should be clearly understood that the purpose of the suggestion is not to limit the discretion of the Commission in hearing other witnesses. (Mark the words 'other witnesses.') His Majesty's Government suggest that a similar procedure should be adopted with the Provincial Legislatures.'

"We shall only have the privilege which we already enjoy of giving evidence before this Commission.

"Then, Sir, we have another stage in Parliament to which I need not refer, because the amendment does not refer to that. That is so far as His Excellency the Viceroy's statement is concerned. Then we come to the debates in the House of Lords where His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, Lord Birkenhead, made the position perfectly clear. He said:

'How can any one, in those circumstances, pretend that whatever point may be disputable, the responsibility of Parliament, not only does still survive but, is not an exclusive responsibility (mark the words 'exclusive responsibility') from which Parliament cannot divorce itself without being false to the long and glorious history of the association of England and India.'

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[25th January 1928]

"In regard to the association of England with India, his Lordship says in another place in the same speech :

'But let it be plainly said, and it cannot be too plainly said, that Parliament cannot, and will not, repudiate its own duties or its own responsibility in this matter.'

"I ask my friends whether it is possible for them to improve on that unequivocal statement, and imagine that somehow or other these committees will get some voice in the shaping of the decision of this Commission. Then, his Lordship makes reference to communal and racial differences on which I wish to say a word later on if I get a chance. I only want to say with regard to these committees what his Lordship says. His Lordship says: 'These committees are invited in a spirit of great sincerity to co-operate as colleagues with the Commission.' To do what? 'We afford them the opportunity of confronting our Commission with their own proposals, which can be made public, which can be analysed and criticized and can be accepted or rejected, after that analysis and criticism.' Is that giving you a voice, I ask in the name of common sense, that in the shaping of the decision of that Commission you can place your proposals, and they will examine them and accept or reject them? Then we go on to the speech of the amiable ex-Secretary of State, Lord Oliver. He wanted many things, but he did not have the courage to enforce his proposals. My Friend, the Christian representative of Trichinopoly, pathetically referred to the speech of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. I am yet to learn that the leader of the Opposition in Parliament could commit the Government to any course of action. Even then, what is the position of the Labour Party? It demanded in a resolution that there should be joint meetings of the two Commissions for taking evidence and, after all the evidence has been heard and enquiries made, further consultation between the two Commissions and the report in full should in due course be presented to the Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament. What was the answer? Lord Reading, a past Viceroy of India, turned down Lord Oliver's proposals with great contempt, and said 'without attempting to travel in detail, to suggest for a moment that there should be two reports, one by an Indian Committee and another by a Commission to be appointed, would really be placing the Parliamentary Commission in a position which I do not think I am exaggerating when I describe it as impossible.' Therefore the committees cannot report and will not be allowed to report. Lord Birkenhead intervened later in the debate and did not say a word in answer to Lord Oliver's proposal.

"Then we come to the third stage of the debate in the House of Commons when Mr. Ramsay Macdonald indulged in a series of proposals which the Government declined to accept. He said that these committees must exchange views with the Commission when they arrive here. He wants them to be given power to supplement the number of witnesses. Even assuming these two conditions are satisfied and the Commission talks across tea tables, across dinner tables and across lunch tables or they are given the privileges to examine certain number of witnesses, does it constitute the effective shaping of the decision of these committees? Then, Sir, we are told by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald with reference to the report of these committees—and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald treats us as less than school children—he says 'I don't think these committees need report to us, they can report to their own toy Parliament and they can do what they like'. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald agrees with Lord Reading, Lord Birkenhead and

25th January 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

Earl Winterton that these committees cannot and ought not to report to Parliament; but he only adds that they should report to their own Legislative Assembly.

"The last chronological statement with regard to this matter is the Royal Warrant of appointment, from which I want to read only three lines; His Majesty gives them power 'to appoint with the sanction of the Secretary of State for India any person or persons to make subordinate enquiries and to report the result to the Commission.' I trust, Mr. President, that my hon. Friend and those who may think with him that functions have not been clearly and unambiguously assigned to these committees of the legislature, they will now be satisfied that they cannot, and will not be given an effective voice in the shaping of the decision of the Commission, and that therefore the only self-respecting course for Indians of all shades of political opinion is to say that we have no use for this Commission and that we should vote for the motion as it stands here as amended by my hon. Friend. I would appeal to him particularly to note that this amendment is comprehensive enough to include all relevant and dignified and honourable points of view. I therefore commend to this House not to vote for my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar's amendment which takes us nowhere, but merely seeks to put off 'the evil day,' according to the same Member. This thing is impossible. We have got to tell His Majesty's Government and the British Government here that this Commission is not acceptable to us. If they change this Commission and if they make other proposals, it will be time to consider them; our Congress Party's position is clear: we have no use for Commissions at all: we stand for self-determination, we want a Round Table Conference to settle the political future of India on the Swaraj basis. When new circumstances arise, it would be open to them to review the position. I therefore commend to this House earnestly that they should consult the dignity and self-respect, in this great conflict, of this House, and fall into line with the decision of the Indian National Congress, the All-India Muslim League, the All-India Liberal Federation, the All-India Trade Union Congress and the Central Provinces Legislative Council itself. And I appeal to the hon. Ministers that they have got a distinguished example to follow, that they must give a lead and not to sit neutral, not making up their minds this way or that way at this moment, they must give a straight lead, an honest lead and an honourable lead and I appeal to them to stand by their countrymen, that they should remember that they are Ministers, that Ministries will come and go, but the dignity of this nation will be seriously jeopardized if they abdicate their functions at this moment. I appeal to all my friends of the Justice Party and the Independent Party to stand by the nation and turn down the amendment and vote for the motion."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Mr. President, Sir, I think it is very desirable at this stage we make our position clear. If we have to-day voted for the amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar, it is because we have done so with a view that we have nothing to do with the Commission as constituted under section 84-A of the Government of India Act. It is on that interpretation that we have supported the amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. Sir, it has been a well-understood maxim in all the colonies of the British Empire that where responsible institutions have been established, the natural course for the Parliament is itself to cease to function. Strangely for our country the British people when the Government of India Act was on

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] [25th January 1928]

the anvil said that they have given responsible Government and that they have made a good beginning in responsible Government, but at the same time they go on passing Acts after Acts imposing liabilities on the Government of India and on the provinces. You cannot find in the case of any other colony the Parliament passing Civil Service Act, the Indian Church Act and so on without taking into consideration the views of the Indian nation, and also in the teeth of the opposition of the Indian people and their representatives. This being the case, it is at this stage idle to think of co-operating with the Commission that is constituted to sit in judgment over our destinies. The Congress never undertook to work out the Government of India Act and our position as a party is very clear so far as this Commission is concerned. Such of the moderates and the neo-moderates who undertook to work the Government of India Act just very shortly after, found that it was nothing but a mirage. I shall tell this House how motion after motion was brought before the Assembly demanding that more responsibility should be given at once. I refer the hon. Members of this House to the motion of Rai Bahadur J. N. Mazumdar on the 23rd September 1921 for full provincial autonomy and diarchy in the Central Government. That was carried by an overwhelming majority when there was no member of the Swaraj Party in any of the legislatures. Then again, Sir, on the 5th February 1924, Diwan Bahadur T. Ranga Achariyar brought in a resolution. He demanded that responsible Government should be established in India, or, in his own words, 'responsible Government within and dominion status without' and then the Congress Party gave its own motion as it stands to-day demanding a Round Table Conference on the basis of which the Indian constitution can be decided. That was passed by 76 votes against 48. Then on the 7th September 1925, Sir Alexander Muddiman, then Leader of the House in the Assembly, moved to accept the Majority Report of the Muddiman Committee. On that occasion the Congress Party also tabled its own motion, that is the motion demanding a Round Table Conference and laying down conditions which are necessary to satisfy the Indian aspirations, and the same was passed by 72 votes against 45."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am trying my best to understand how this will be relevant to the discussion, i.e., the history of the various motions moved in the Assembly."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"That is to show that we never at any time wanted the Commission."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Here the question is to leave the door open for negotiation for the appointment and status of the committees. The amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar is now for the consideration of the House."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Are we not to have our say on the amendment of my Friend Mr. Chettiyar, which is to be substituted by that of Mr. Nayar?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"There will be another occasion for that."

1 p.m.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"I am sorry, Sir. That being so, there is no justification for us now to co-operate with the Commission, which is appointed not at the desire of the people of this country, nor on the demand of their representatives, but by Parliament at a time when India was hopelessly divided. Sir, Lord Curzon earned our thanks for having given an

25th January 1928] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasaya]

awakening to India in 1905 by the partition of Bengal. Now the credit goes to Lord Birkenhead for giving us this Commission which has tended to unite the various communal and political parties, liberals and extremists, and practically brought the liberals nearer to the Congress. All this shows that no party in this House or outside it wants the Commission. Why then quarrel about words? My hon. Friend, the Member for the University, has shown that the committees of legislatures cannot do any good as they are bound to take a subordinate position. In these circumstances, we are not for any committees. What can any committee do? If it is one of compiling the number of Bills certified by the Governor, the number of censure motions flouted and the number of resolutions treated as scraps of paper, the Secretariat is there ready with their files, and the special officers with their notes."

* Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I wish to say just a few words explaining the purpose and the scope of the amendment that has been moved by Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar as the representative of our party. At a very early stage of this movement against the Simon Commission, I was one of those called upon to speak and I may say that the speech that I then made was perhaps very much the same as the speech we heard from the Deputy Leader of the Swarajist Party just now. (Swarajists: Hear, hear.) But, still, I do think that there is justification for the amendment that has now been moved by Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. I do quite agree that the earlier pronouncements made by the authorities in England and elsewhere were of a very disappointing character. Especially the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy made at the time he announced the constitution of the Commission did not assign to the committees proposed to be appointed by the various legislative bodies any position which could be considered to be dignified. Now, the latest pronouncement of Lord Birkenhead has given us some hope that the mentality of the British authority has to a very great extent changed. He has said that there was to be as little interference on his side as possible and he was transferring from his shoulders the responsibility that till then rested on him to Sir John Simon and his colleagues. And so it seemed to the members of our party who met quite recently that it was only fair that there must still be room left for Lord Birkenhead and Sir John Simon and others to have a sort of *locus penitentiae* in this matter. Well, Sir, we yield to none—we yield not even to Mr. S. Satyamurti—in our desire to maintain the self-respect of the nation. (Cries of hear, hear.) We do feel as indignant as they do in respect of the constitution of the Commission. But the amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar to which most of the members of the Swarajist Party have given their assent is liable to the usual criticism that is advanced against our proposals, that they are very vague and do not mean anything definite. Mr. Satyamurti said that, if Mr. Krishnan Nayar's amendment is accepted, it will lead nowhere. Perhaps, Sir, I may say that criticism will be more legitimate if it was advanced against the amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar which has been accepted by the House. I was one of those, no doubt, who voted for the amendment because I am one of those who think that it will be a disaster not to have a resolution passed accepting boycott in some form or other (hear, hear). If nothing else is going to be passed, I shall be certainly a party to the passing of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar's amendment. But I do think that the amendment moved by Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar will be an improvement on

[Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar] [25th January 1928]

that of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar for this reason, that it has placed before the House something more definite than that of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. As the hon. the Revenue Member remarked, whatever be the mental reservations behind those words 'as at present constituted' there is no difference between the motion as tabled by the members of the Swarajist Party and the amendment moved by Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. Though I do not agree with every word of what the hon. the Member for Revenue has said, I do think there is a good deal of substantial truth in that statement. Unless we are prepared to say in our amendment something definite, to give some way out for the British Government and the other authorities, to get out of the first blunder which they had committed, I should think any amendment will be purposeless. It is in that view, to afford a chance for the exercise by them of the *locus penitentiae* to which I hope every human being and human institution must have a right, that we have tabled this amendment. It is not because we are lacking in the desire to express our indignation and resentment at the constitution of the Commission, or are unwilling to co-operate with the other parties or organizations who want a boycott of this Commission. Nothing that the British Government has done within recent years has created a greater unity or roused a greater amount of popular indignation in this country than the present constitution of the Commission has done. We do realize it as much as the Swarajists, but we do think that this amendment tabled by us would be free from the criticism usually advanced that we are making vague statements and do not commit ourselves to anything. It is only for that reason that we have tabled this amendment and not because, as the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Swarajist Party seems to think, that we are less desirous to-day of expressing our indignation and joining the boycott unless conditions improve very materially. With these few words, I say that the amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar is really justifiable and does not in any way militate against the views of the Congress Party as expressed in the amendment of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar."

* Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, as a Congressman, I desire to say a few words on the resolution and the amendment proposed. The Congress has passed a resolution recently. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. Let us first of all deal with the amendment of Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar. For the convenience of the House, I may again say that the amendment of Mr. Krishnan Nayar is for the consideration of the House. If hon. Members want to speak generally on the amendment as accepted, I think they will have ample opportunities to do so."

* Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR :—"I am opposing it, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I request the hon. Member not to speak on the amendment or the resolution of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti but only confine his remarks to the amendment of Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar."

"I think Mr. J. A. Saldanha wants a chance to speak generally on the resolution."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"On this particular point, Sir?"

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—"He wants to speak on every point,"

25th January 1928]

*The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Then he may not catch the eye of the President on the general point. I think the House is now ready for the vote on the motion of Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar."

The question is

"In lines 2 to 7 for the words 'the resentment of this Council legislatures of India' substitute the words 'that this Council is of opinion that in the official announcement of the appointment of the Royal Commission, the status and functions of the Committees of the Legislatures are not clearly defined and that until an authoritative declaration is made, giving the Committees of the legislature an effective voice in the shaping of the decisions of the Commission at all important stages, this Council cannot co-operate with the work of the Commission'."

The motion was put to the House and declared lost.

Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar demanded a poll and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 11. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 2. " H. B. Ari Gowder. | 12. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishna Nayar. |
| 3. " A. B. Shetti. | 13. " P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 4. Mahmud Sohamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 5. Mr. N. Siva Raj. | 15. " T. K. Chidambaramatha Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. | 16. Itao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 7. " S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 17. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 8. " P. Siva Rao. | 18. T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. " C. Gopala Menon. | 19. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 10. The Raja of Panagal. | 20. " K. Sitarama Reddiyar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. The Zamindar of Seithur. | 23. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. |
| 2. Mr. V. Ch. John. | 24. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. |
| 3. " C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. | 25. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. " Ramanath Goenka. | 26. Mr. Mothay Narayana Rao. |
| 5. " Nagan Gowda. | 27. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| 6. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 28. " A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 7. " Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. | 29. " C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 8. " S. V. Vanavudaiya Goundar. | 30. Baheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. " S. N. Dorai Raja. | 31. Mr. P. Bhaktavatsalu Nayudu. |
| 10. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. | 32. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. U. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 33. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 12. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 34. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 13. " S. Satyamurti. | 35. " K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| 14. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 36. " L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 15. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 37. " K. R. Karant. |
| 16. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 38. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 17. " P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 39. " K. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 18. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 40. " B. Venkataratnam. |
| 19. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 41. " J. A. Saldanha. |
| 20. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 42. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. |
| 21. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. | |
| 22. Mr. K. V. R. Swami Nayudu. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 5. The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogya-swami Mudaliyar. |
| 2. " Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 6. " Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 4. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 8. Dr. (Mrs.) Muthulakshmi Reddi. |

Neutral—cont.

[25th January 1928]

- | | |
|--|---|
| 9. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 23. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar. | 24. „ K. Krishnan. |
| 11. „ F. B. Evans. | 25. „ C. E. Wood. |
| 12. „ H. A. Watson. | 26. „ J. Mackenzie Smith. |
| 13. „ G. T. Boag. | 27. „ G. W. Chambers. |
| 14. „ A. M. C. Tampoe. | 28. „ H. F. P. Hearson. |
| 15. „ S. H. Slater. | 29. „ K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 16. „ R. Foulkes. | 30. „ G. R. Premayya. |
| 17. „ J. Bheemayya. | 31. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 18. „ Muppil Nayar. | 32. The Kumararaja of Venkatagiri. |
| 19. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 33. Mr. M. A. Manickavelu Nayakar. |
| 20. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 34. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 21. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambudripad. | 35. Muhammad Khadir Mohideen Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | |

Ayes 20. Noes 42. Neutral 35.

The motion was negatived.

BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ May I know the number of neutral Members, Sir ? ”

* The hon. the **PRESIDENT** :—“ The proceedings will show that. ”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ The number of neutral Members, Sir ? ”

* The hon. the **PRESIDENT** :—“ Thirty-five. They are not large enough to carry the motion. ” (Laughter.)

1-15 p.m. * The hon. the **PRESIDENT** :—“ I think it will be for the convenience of the House if, at this stage, I put the amendment of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, as further amended by Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar, to the vote of the House. The motion before the House is this :

‘ In lines 2 to 7 for the words “ do convey . . . legislatures in India ” substitute the words “ be pleased to convey to the Viceroy and His Majesty’s Government that this Council has no confidence in and will have no thing to do with the Statutory Commission as it is at present constituted ” . ’

The motion was put and declared lost.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti demanded a poll and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. | 21. Mr. C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 22. „ G. Harisaravottama Rao. |
| 3. Mr. A. B. Shetti. | 23. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. |
| 4. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 24. Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 5. „ R. Nagan Gowda. | 25. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. |
| 6. „ T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 26. Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur. |
| 7. „ C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. | 27. Mr. D. Narayana Raju. |
| 8. „ Ramananth Goenka. | 28. Dr. B. S. Mallaya. |
| 9. „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 29. K. Uppi Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. „ Chavadi K. Subrahmanya Pillai. | 30. Mr. C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 11. „ S. V. Vanavudaiya Goundar. | 31. „ Narayana Rao. |
| 12. „ U. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 32. „ C. Obi Reddi. |
| 13. „ M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. | 33. „ A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 14. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 34. „ C. Ramasomaya Julu. |
| 15. „ S. Satyamurti. | 35. Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. |
| 16. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 36. „ P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 17. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 37. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 18. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 38. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 19. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 39. „ K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 20. „ P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 40. „ K. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |

Ayes—cont.

25th January 1928]

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 41. Mr. L. K. Tulasiram. | 54. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapat |
| 42. " K. B. Karant. | Mudaliyar. |
| 43. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. | 55. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 44. " K. Madhavan Nayar. | 56. " P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 45. " B. Venkataratnam. | 57. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 46. " S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 58. " T. K. Chidambaramatha Mudaliyar. |
| 47. " P. Siva Rao. | 59. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 48. " J. A. Saldanha. | 60. Mahammad Kadir Mohideen Sahib |
| 49. " C. Gopala Menon. | Bahadur. |
| 50. The Kumararaja of Venkatagiri. | 61. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddi- |
| 51. Syed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur. | yar. |
| 52. Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 62. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 53. " B. Ramachandra Reddi. | 63. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. |
| | 64. Rao Bahadur K. Sifarama Reddiyar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 15. Mr. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. |
| 2. " Sir Norman Marjorikanks. | 16. Mr. Muppil Nair of Kavalappara. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 17. Mr. N. Siva Raj. |
| Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 18. " M. Gangadhara Siva. |
| 4. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 19. " L. C. Guruswami. |
| 5. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 20. " V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 6. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar. | 21. " K. Krishnan. |
| 7. " F. B. Evans. | 22. " C. E. Wood. |
| 8. " H. A. Watson. | 23. " S. M. Smith. |
| 9. " G. T. Boag. | 24. " G. W. Chambers. |
| 10. " A. M. C. Tampoe. | 25. " H. F. P. Hearson. |
| 11. " S. H. Slater. | 26. " G. R. Premayya. |
| 12. " P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 27. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 13. " R. Foulkes. | 28. Mr. S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 14. " V. Ch. John. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogya- | 8. Mr. Ramjee Rao. |
| swami Mudaliyar. | 9. " S. Venkayya. |
| 2. " Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 10. " K. Abdul Hye Sahib. |
| 3. The Zamindar of Seithur. | 11. " K. Ramachandra Padayachi. |
| 4. Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder. | 12. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 5. " J. Bheemayya. | 13. The Raja of Panagal. |
| 6. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 14. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayana Nambudi- | 15. T. M. Modico Sahib Bahadur. |
| ripad. | |

Ayes 64. Noes 28. Neutral 15.

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Now, the amended motion is for the discussion of the House."

At this stage the House adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The amended resolution runs thus :—

'That this Council recommends to the Government that they be pleased to convey to the Viceroy and His Majesty's Government that this Council has no confidence in and will have nothing to do with the Statutory Commission as it is at present constituted.'"

* Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, as a Congressman I desire to say a few words on the resolution. The Congress has passed a resolution in the following terms regarding this matter :—

'Whereas the British Government have appointed the Statutory Commission in utter disregard of India's right to self-determination, this Congress resolves that the only self-respecting course for India to adopt is to boycott the Commission at every stage and in every form.'

[Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar]

[25th January 1928]

"Here follows directions as to how the boycott is to be carried out.

"I desire to assert that we, Congressmen, stand by this resolution. To us the Statutory Commission in any form, however constituted and whatever its terms of reference, is unacceptable, if the procedure in any manner fails to give effect to our right to self-determination. If our party amendment does not take up this attitude in its fullness, it is because on a question of such nation-wide importance we want to accommodate other parties as much as it is consistent with our principles. It is not to be understood that we have given up the position implied in the Congress resolution. For the purpose of securing unanimity, we are willing to lower our flag in the words of our leader. But let me declare that at no time will the Congress accept any Statutory Commission in derogation of the principle of self-determination.

"In my address as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the recent session of the Indian National Congress, I drew pointed attention to some of the reasons why we should boycott this Commission. I then said:

'Firstly under the principles involved and the pledges given during the Great War we are entitled to decide what the form and extent of our self-government should be. In spite of the most solemn declarations and pledges given by the foremost British statesmen, India was insulted by the inclusion in the Preamble to the Government of India Act of 1919, of terms which denied her right to self-determination. This was a gross betrayal and treachery which the united voice of India had been relentlessly condemning. To acquiesce in the assertion of that pernicious doctrine now implied in the appointment of an all-British Commission would be to abandon our self-respect.'

'Secondly, the circumstances of the appointment of the Commission constitute a contemptuous rejection of the National Demand passed by the Legislative Assembly in 1924 and reiterated in 1925. No reason has been vouchsafed to us why the Assembly's demand has been dealt with in this perfunctory manner. It is an insult to the elected representatives of our people and consequently to the entire Indian nation.

'Thirdly, even the moderate demand made by the Liberals for the inclusion of a substantial proportion of Indians in the Commission has been ignored. I desire it to be distinctly understood that we, the Congressmen, will not be satisfied with anything less than a Constituent Convention for the determination of our future constitution, in which representatives of Britain may also be permitted to deliberate, but only as equals to safeguard any vested interests they may have in this country. The inclusion, in the Commission, of Indians chosen at random will not conciliate the Congress which stands for the principle of self-determination, logically worked out.'

'Fourthly, the Commission should be ruthlessly boycotted, for it implies the application to India of doctrines which are contrary to the usages governing the relations between England and the Dominions. Shall we permit ourselves to be dealt with as inferiors in the Commonwealth of Nations forming the British Empire? An emphatic negative must be our unequivocal answer. Canada, Australia and South Africa were allowed the right of self-determination; and with one important exception the Parliament no more tinkered with their drafts than merely dot the i's and cross the t's. Why should India alone be forced to a different course of constitutional development? It implies inferiority and we must resist every such implication. And further we desire to assert on this occasion that it is essential to the dignity and national self-respect of India not to permit any extraneous authorities and influences however potent to dictate to her what her government should be. To acquiesce in the unwarranted and dangerous presumption of the British Parliament would be a surrender of our self-respect and would harm and demoralize our public life, not to mention the degradation in which it would involve us among the civilized nations of the world. Further it is amply clear that our non-participation in this Commission will not anyway jeopardise our political progress. The haughty Conservatives of the British Parliament whose ranks are reinforced by the no less jingoist section of Labourites under Mr. Ramsay MacDonald whose political masquerade as friends of India is at an end have already prejudged our case, and there is nothing to be lost by our stern refusal to regularize their judgment by helping in the so-called inquiry. I have therefore no hesitation in adding my humble voice to the chorus of approval which has met the Boycott programme.

[Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar]

25th January 1928]

'I desire at this stage to make one or two observations on the misgivings felt by honest friends of India as to our attitude towards certain domestic questions, peculiarly the legacy of British Rule in India. I assure the minorities and the special interests who have been persistently misled by interested persons that in a free and democratic India their interests would be safer than now. India has through history been the asylum of the oppressed and the persecuted and it is part of our national character to treat minorities hospitably and even charitably. Protection to minorities will be the first canon of political conduct in Swaraj India.

'Next we must repudiate the suggestion that Britain should ever be the peace-maker in India holding its diverse interests and peoples in justice to each other, but in subjection to herself. We must proclaim our right and our capacity to settle equitably and honourably all these delicate questions. Thus there is no argument for co-operation with the Statutory Commission except the argument of fear, of toadyism and of atrophied political sense.'

'Now, Sir, I desire to add just a few words more. Hon. Members seem to think that if the Legislative Committees are given equal status and powers with the Commission itself, we might then co-operate with the present Commission. There is a fallacy in the position. Congressmen have always taken the view that these Legislatures with the over-dose of official and nominated members, not to mention the representatives of the so-called special interests, are not the true reflection of the Indian democracy, and cannot negotiate on behalf of the nation. What we really want is, to use the familiar but clumsy expression, a Round Table Conference of equals, met to decide common questions. This is really self-determination, and not the other arrangement by which our fitness is examined by governmental committees, responsible not to the people of the country, but to the Government itself.

'Let me now make an appeal to the Justice Party to whole-heartedly support us on this unique occasion. By voting for this resolution they lose nothing, but the nation gains in unanimity and the strength that unanimity yields. Do they imagine that the authorities in England are really going to alter their arrangements to accommodate them? It is an illusion to think that the Legislative Committees will be placed on an equal footing with the Commission, even if that arrangement were satisfactory. I ask them to read the proceedings of Parliament, and they will then understand it. What Mr. Ramsay Macdonald did not achieve, our friends cannot hope to. I ask them to shake off their misgivings and mistrust and walk into our camp at least on an issue of this character. This habit of co-operation will grow, and will help the growth of a united nation resisting and overcoming the matchless oppressions of these aliens.

'My next appeal is to the Ministers and their followers. The Chief Minister in particular has always prided himself that he was as much a Congressman as any of us on this side of the House. It is up to him now to prove that claim by standing by the Congress mandate. Very disappointing announcements have appeared in the press as to his attitude. I must ask him not to betray the country, for it amounts to nothing less if he should not support us. To the Ministerialists I must say that we have now a claim on their support. Now that their amendment has been passed, they should join us in their full numbers.

'I shall conclude this long speech by appealing, fervently and in a spirit of humility, to the members of the backward communities, to come over to us, as in all future they must sink or sail with us. The days of British

[Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar] [25th January 1928]

Imperialism are numbered, and they will be both unpatriotic and foolish to ally with that decaying institution against us. Let them forget not, too, that even the position to which they have now attained is the result of years of unselfish work of the Congress and Congressmen. I ask them earnestly to cast their lot with us in joy and in suffering.

“With these words I support the amended resolution before the House.”

MR. N. SIVA RAJ :—“Mr. President, it is a matter for regret that any Indian should feel delighted to oppose this motion. Sir, the decision to boycott the Simon Commission rests upon one or two grounds. The first is the right of self-determination. It is very interesting and in fact very inspiring to use such words as ‘self-determination’, ‘self-government’ and ‘Swaraj’, but the conditions are wanting in our country at the present day. Because those people who to-day clamour for Swaraj, that they should have a constitution of their own, that they have got the right of self-determination, have failed to stand by their country in their attitude towards their own kith and kin. May I tell them that, while they recognize the bane of untouchability, do they not still refuse the depressed classes to take water from their own wells? Again, while they deplore their illiteracy, do they not refuse admission to the depressed classes in their institutions? It is more than a decade when they recognized these evils and still nothing has been done to ameliorate them.

“I am with the Mover of the resolution in boycotting the Simon Commission. (Hear, hear.) I am for freedom, provided that when it comes it is not monopolized by a certain class of people at the top. (Cries of ‘No, no’.) The past does not warrant the conclusion of the voices, and it is full of despair. (Cries of ‘No, no’.) That we are untouchables, you say because we do not fare better at your hands. Does not history repeat itself? What happened in the past will happen in the future. But we will agree to any scheme under which our interests may be safeguarded. But what we fear is that in the present state of our country, whatever in theory or in law we may be entitled to, in practice that power will be ineffective. Because, know that even the limited franchise given to us under the Reforms we are not able to exercise. At every stage in our life and for everything we have to do we are under the thumb of the caste Hindus. We want to support the Simon Commission, not in any spirit of opposition to those who want to boycott it, but merely because we want to avail ourselves of the opportunity that this Commission affords—impartial body that it is—of placing our case before that body and through that body, before the British Empire and before the whole world. Our case is that for two thousand years the people who have been living side by side with us have treated us as no better than animals. They have treated us like dogs. They say that they are our brethren, but they have treated us worse than brutes.”

MR. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—“What are the Englishmen doing?”

MR. N. SIVA RAJ :—“It is no part of my case.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Hon. Members will not be in order if they interrupt in long sentences. Only monosyllabic interruptions are allowed.”

MR. N. SIVA RAJ :—“I have been asked how the Englishmen treat us. I am not here to express an opinion on that matter. Those who aspire for the freedom of India ought to know that they should treat us better. Have

25th January 1928]

[Mr. N. Siva Raj]

they done anything practically to help the depressed classes? (Cries of 'Yes'.) Mahatma Gandhi wanted to do something for the depressed classes; but he has been given the go-by by the Swarajists. (Mr. Satyamurti: 'No'.) It is Mahatma Gandhi who brought the question of the depressed classes into practical politics. But finding that it would be inconvenient, it has been given the go-by. (Voices: 'No, no'.) I shall discuss this question outside the House if anybody desires it; but I do not want to be interrupted here.

"We want to exercise our self-determination and put our case before the Commission and show to the whole world that 60 million human beings are treated in this corner of the world as worse than brutes. I do not believe in self-determination as a principle; it is only an impulse to certain definite action. I am one of those who believe that no freedom, no real freedom, can be got for India without the co-operation of the depressed classes. (Hear, hear.) All such questions as the Hindu-Muslim problem will be solved automatically if the question of the depressed classes is solved first. But till then we want to be under the protection of some power, because we are not in a position to trust our own countrymen. For as soon as the power is released from the British Government it will go into the hands of the educated classes who are mostly the caste Hindus. What step did they take for the last ten years for the elevation of the depressed classes?

"Some hon. Members say that they would be willing to co-operate with the Commission if the committees of the Legislative Councils are given equal powers with the Commission. But we have no faith in the committees of the Legislature as they are at present constituted. Even then we will have to put our case before the Commission. That is the reason why we do not want to boycott this Commission. Our past experience tells us that there is nothing to justify us to co-operate with the other parties in boycotting the Commission."

MR. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, I did not propose to join in this debate on a question which has been agitating the country ever since the announcement of the Statutory Commission. It really pained me and must have pained every patriotic Indian to hear a brother Indian coming forward to co-operate with the Commission for the simple reason that his community had not been treated properly by another section of his countrymen. Assuming for the sake of argument that these backward communities have been cruelly treated, how does it justify them to co-operate with the foreigner who has insulted his country? During the Great War did the ordinary people in England refuse to fight side by side with the rich people simply because they had not had all the comforts and amenities of life enjoyed by the rich people, the lords? Did not all of them to a man go and fight the enemy? Did the labourers stay at home because the capitalists had not redressed their grievances? Is this the time I ask, for any Indian, however depressed he may be, to come forward to co-operate with the Commission? Sir, I earnestly appeal to my brothers who belong to the Adi-Dravida community not to lose this opportunity of co-operating with their own countrymen at this juncture and pave the way for better understanding and co-operation hereafter. By co-operating with the other communities at this time, they will be paving the way for the attainment of Swaraj where all the communities will have equal powers and

[Mr. Abdul Hamid Khan]

[25th January 1928]

facilities. How long are they going to depend, let me ask them, upon those whose interests are not in this country but are mainly outside the country? They are not here either for the Adi-Dravidas or for the Brahmans; they are not here either for the Hindus or for the Muhammadans; they are here only for themselves. How then do they expect any help from them any longer? What did they do during the past 150 years while the power was in their hands? What did they do for the education of the depressed classes and for removing the various other disabilities they suffer from? It is not because of the social disabilities they suffer from that they were not able to do much to raise them from the present status. These social disabilities would have vanished long ago if the British Government had a mind to give them educational and other facilities. It is only recently since the Reforms were introduced which gave the people some little power that something has been done for the Adi-Dravidas. But what about the century and a half previously? Did not this community consisting of seven million people appeal to the British Government; did they not always serve them; and what was the return for all this? Their present condition shows that. Mr. President, I appeal to them to co-operate with us when their co-operation is most needed and not to lag behind any other community. They are our brothers; we are all equals and we will continue to be equals hereafter. Let not our domestic quarrels which can be easily solved when we are free in this country stand in the way of their co-operating with us."

3 p.m.

Rao Sahib R. SRINIVASAN :—"Mr. President, Sir, I am a member of the depressed classes. I represent them on this Council. They are treated by the caste Hindus as untouchables, unapproachables and even as unseeables. These untouchables have complaints to make to the Royal Commission against the touchables. Inclusion of an Indian in any capacity in the Royal Commission of enquiry will be prejudicial to the untouchables.

"To boycott the Royal Commission is to treat it as untouchable and unapproachable. Boycotting of the Royal Commission is a political bluffing. It is to blind the Commission that it may not know anything about castes, which are accumulations of drugs and pestilence of ages in India.

"Of all the invaders of India, Aryans were the worst. They entangled Indians in a system of castes which divided them into several sections to rule one over the other and to live one upon the other and to exclude those that did not get into the caste entanglement as untouchables. Caste and untouchability are curses in India brought by Aryans of which the political leaders in India now say that they feel ashamed to face a foreigner in whose country such a curse does not exist.

"Englishmen came into India as traders. By accident they became rulers. Indians helped them to put the country in order. Communications were opened by several means; western education, free trade and freedom to women were given. Hon. Members of this House see to-day an Indian woman, I mean our hon. Deputy President, take the President's Chair. Englishmen, the rulers, bow to be ruled and sit at the foot of the Chair. Sir, was there any government in India so just, so liberal and so democratic? Had the Englishmen made up their minds to rule the country permanently, they would have immigrated their people to cold regions in India, established a Government like what is in Australia, Canada and other countries, framed laws and regulations to suit them, kept Indians in ignorance and subservience that they might live upon them. No; they want to put the country in order, free and capable to manage itself.

25th January 1928]

[Mr. R. Srinivasan]

“His Majesty the King-Emperor sends certain able and impartial men to enquire into the various conditions and to ascertain if the present form of self-government can be extended. I hope Indians who aspire for full self-government or independence will be honest and not try to throw dust in the eyes of the Commission.

“We untouchables want the Commission to enquire into our grievances and to extend the degree of responsible Government as the untouchables advance in social and economic conditions.

“If the Commission goes back without any enquiry on the degree of responsible Government extended, leaving the untouchables in the hands of their oppressors, the lives of the untouchables—sixty millions of them in India—will not be worth living.

“We welcome the Royal Commission. I oppose the motion.”

Mr T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, it is a well-known fact that in all civilized countries the Legislative Council represents real public opinion. But the recent history of the Council will not unfortunately justify that conclusion. Often and often has this Council passed resolutions which do not represent the views of the public. But to-day I rejoice at the prospect of presenting to proud England the real feelings of the Indian mind. I therefore consider this day as a red-letter day in the legislative history of our province.

“My task, Sir, has therefore been rendered easier and I shall address a few words to only those who want to stand neutral or who have made up their minds to oppose this resolution. It is also a well-known fact that people often fail to put themselves in the position of others and realise what result their action would have upon them. It is this misunderstanding that is the cause of differences among us. I request those gentlemen who have either made up their minds or are making up their minds not to join us, to put themselves in our position for a few minutes and to realise what this attitude of theirs means to us. To understand the mind of the country there cannot be a better study than that of the resolutions of the National Assembly, known as the Indian National Congress. The resolutions of that National Assembly are so very fresh in the minds of the public that I need not repeat them here. But in drawing attention to the resolutions of that National Body I request hon. Members to study not only the resolution about the boycott of the Simon Commission but also other resolutions which have been passed along with that resolution. I request hon. Members to remember that the boycott of the Simon Commission was resolved upon not as an isolated act but as a course of conduct which, under the present policy of Great Britain, is the only one which a self-respecting ruled race can adopt.

“Sir, the world is now full of rumours about the next war. People who have been to Europe have come back carrying tales about the great preparations—obviously secret—which are going on in the minds of our British rulers; they aim at putting down the Asiatic Menace. To support that view we had only very recently the attitude shown by England towards China. When two sections of the Chinese people were quarrelling among themselves, what justification was there for Britain to send enormous troops? Again, Sir, we know that the action of Britain in Egypt has been condemned by the civilized world; we also know—though it is not recent—that England’s

[Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar] [25th January 1928]

attitude towards Turkey would have been very much different but for the fact that Turkey was able to assert her self-respect. To go a little further back into history, I would draw the attention of the House to the history of Ireland. What terrible years were passed through by the Irish when the English tried to put down their national aspirations with an iron hand, with blood and with gun-powder. There have been many an incident during the last few years in the history of England which naturally filled the mind of the world, especially the Asiatic world, with the sinister moves of England towards suppressing what is called the Asiatic Menace. If a more tangible proof is wanted I remind the House of the Singapore case. Therefore it is that the Indians have got a natural apprehension that the intention of England towards India is not all well in spite of kind words."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the hon. Member will be in order if he shows his disapproval of the constitution of the Commission but not of the acts of the British nation."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—"At this critical time Miss Mayo in America has published blood-curdling statistics from the figures and the records of hospitals and of Government Departments who have given her information to produce a most morbid book. Indians may be deceived for a hundred and fifty years. But they are not so blind as to be deceived any longer. If we put all these facts together we feel suspicious about the intentions of England. At such a time it is the duty of England, if she wanted to be honest and if she wanted to convince the world that she is honest, to have given us a Commission which would have helped the Indians to frame their own constitution. But to impose a Commission, upon a long-suffering people, consisting entirely of men of their own race, consisting mostly of dark horses with no previous sympathy or knowledge of India is to insult the Indian nation. In spite of the loud pronouncements of Lord Birkenhead the committees which are to be appointed—it is an after-thought—would have no real power at all. I therefore appeal to this House to help us in adopting the only course open to a self-respecting people, viz., to boycott this Commission."

* Mr. S. H. SLATER :—"Sir, I should like to add my voice to that of my hon. Friends Mr. Siva Raj and Mr. Srinivasan and to congratulate the depressed classes on the courage they have shown in overcoming the temptation offered to them to join their countrymen in the boycott. It is gratifying to see from the speeches of the various hon. Members in this House what recognition has been given to the importance of the position of the community called the 'depressed classes' in regard to the political future of the country. It is extremely gratifying to notice what importance has been attached to their position. Yesterday, Sir, a challenge was thrown down by the Leader of the Congress Party. He invited the members of the depressed classes to join in what he regarded as the almost unanimous determination to boycott the Commission and to throw in their lot with the Swarajya Party and reap with them the advantages which he said would follow from their action. He asked hon. Members representing the depressed classes 'what had the European or the British Government done for them that they should adhere to that Government'. But as far as I could hear, he had no reply to the very pertinent interjection that arose from the back benches as to what the Indians have done for the depressed classes during the

25th January 1928]

[Mr. S. H. Slater]

last 2,000 years. I feel sure that the Leader of the Congress Party would have answered that question if he had an answer. I am glad to see that the blandishments that he held out have been resisted.

"Possibly he and his Party, or a Swaraj Government of the future will be prepared to offer the members of the depressed classes some consolation such as the removal of those disabilities under which they have been suffering in the matter of amenities of civilization, such as commodious house-sites, good water-supply, and facilities for education and perhaps even to find them an occasional seat on a local board when it does not happen to be required by anyone else. But, Sir, the depressed classes have a much higher ambition than that.

"They and the great mass of the labouring class population of this country form, as it were, the raw material from which can be constructed a political constitution on a much wider basis than anything that has hitherto been devised. I say, Sir, further that no Government in this country can endure, or can bring peace and prosperity to the country which does not make provision for the vast interests of that great part of the population. Sir, what has the Congress Party to offer, what method has it been able to offer to give effect to that obligation of any Government in this country? The British Government, the European administration, has done something. I do not wish to exaggerate, but at least it must be admitted that the British Government, the European Government, has given them equality before the law, and those classes have had consistently the protection of an impartial administration. That is no small matter. But in a constitution where 'election' and 'representation' are the keys to the citadel of power, what hope is there for these vast unenfranchised masses?" 3-15
p.m.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Adult suffrage."

* Mr. S. H. SLATER:—"To give a vote to an uneducated man is merely a polite way of inviting him to commit political suicide. Now, Sir, I have no doubt in my mind whatever that Sir John Simon and his Colleagues on the Commission are aware of this problem. They may possibly have a solution in their fertile minds. But the issue is so vital that it cannot be allowed to go by default. I hope that not only the members of the depressed classes but all those who are interested in the large mass of the population who are unenfranchised, the labouring mass of the population, will not fail to take every step to marshal and mobilize all the information, all the arguments, all the considerations, which can assist in the framing of a constitution in which the political consciousness of this great mass of the population will have full expression; in which there will be for all equal opportunities for progress, moral and material, equal dignity as citizens of this great State. I appeal to the members of the depressed classes and all who are interested in their welfare not to let this opportunity go by, by listening to the siren voice of the tempters. Otherwise, it may be that the door will be shut to them for ever, and they will remain eternally in the outer darkness of moral and political bondage."

* Mr. P. SIVA RAO:—"Sir, now that the ground is clear, I rise to support the resolution as amended by my hon. Friend, Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. In doing so, Sir, I do not wish to cast a silent vote. I shall explain my views on the matter and the reason why I have decided to vote this way. While doing so, Sir, I am sorry to see the hostile attitude taken by my

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

[25th January 1928]

hon. Friend who represents the depressed classes who just now spoke, Mr. Siva Raj. Sir, it is a curse that they should think that their interests are quite safe in the hands of an alien bureaucracy and not in the hands of their own countrymen. I am sure my friends of the depressed classes will admit that whatever has been done towards the amelioration of their lot has been mostly due to the initiative of caste Hindus. The depressed classes have found a supporter in Mr. Slater. It is always the case with these imperialists who pose as the custodians of the interests of the depressed classes, and to say that they are their trustees and that they are trying to elevate them.

“Sir, I will now take up the other aspect of the matter. Sir, the appointment of this Commission, there is no doubt, has caused huge disappointment and widespread discontent in the land. Let me say, Sir, that this Commission has been thrust upon the Indian people in the teeth of the opposition and in spite of the warning that was given by our Indian leader who happened to be in England at that time. But I am glad, Sir, that the appointment of this Commission has been a blessing in disguise. It has produced a unanimity of feeling in the country. It has unified all classes of opinion, all minds, and all persuasions. For instance, Sir, there has been a universal protest not only against the personnel of the Commission, but also against the procedure they have decided to adopt. I see the Indian Liberal Federation, the Indian National Congress, the Moslem League — at least that section of it which is representative—the Indian Christian Congress and last but not least the South India Liberal Federation, all of them have declared that from the nature of the Commission as at present constituted and the procedure that has been announced there is no other option but to boycott the Commission. Now, Sir, when I say this, I wish to point out one thing. Behind all these unanimity of opinion, we must note that there is any amount of divergence of opinion. That these differences are huge and stupendous will be seen from the varying opinions that have been expressed by way of the amendments that have been placed before this House. Let us see on what grounds the Congress Party which has made a soul-stirring appeal to us has based its decision. It is not a question of the inclusion of one or two Indians that will satisfy their demand. But I know personally that it was the exclusion of Indians from the Commission that gave rise to this vexation, but we should note that it was that which gave the matter the turn it has now taken. Inclusion of a few Indians—a few Muhammadans or Christians, or members of the depressed classes—will not satisfy the demand of the Congress Party. The Congress Party demands that India's right to self-determination should be granted. Now, Sir, under the constitution of the Government of India Act, section 84-A contemplates the appointment of a Commission within ten years after the passing of the Reforms Act. Now under the Statute Book, Parliament have taken upon themselves the responsibility of administering this country with due regard to the interests and welfare of all bodies and all communities. It cannot be said, Sir, for a moment, that they should alter their constitution; and I may also point out that in the preamble they distinctly say that the responsibility for the welfare of the Indian people lies with the Parliament. So long as this happens to be in the preamble, and so long as the Government of India Act, section 84-A, provides for the appointment of the Statutory Commission, we cannot clearly question the right of Parliament to decide our affairs. That does not mean, to my mind, giving us an effective voice in

25th January 1928]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

the shaping of the constitution of our country. I for one, Sir, would be satisfied if only the Committee appointed by the Central Legislature is given equal and extensive powers with those of the Commission itself. I am optimistic. I mean the resolution, as it is, is elastic enough. It does not mean absolute boycott. If we can declare our right to self-determination just as South Africa, Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia and frame and present our own constitution to Parliament, I shall be personally glad. If the Congress, for instance, sends up a draft constitution and then sends up an ultimatum along with it, I do understand their position. You will have to take into account the realities of the situation. For the present, we will have to accept Parliament as the sovereign authority."

Mr. S. SATYAMORTI :—" No."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" Very well, you do not. I will maintain that Parliament will have an effective voice in the framing of a constitution for India.

" Now, Sir, the Central Committee of the Indian Legislature will now be only a body that can be summoned at the will and pleasure of this Commission."

* Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I would first of all endorse heartily the remarks made by my friend Mr. Siva Raj regarding the disabilities and difficulties suffered by the depressed classes at the hands of the higher caste and classes of people in this country. My sympathies go out to them and in my own humble way I have been working for my depressed brethren. There are great obstacles in the way and, as my friend on the other side so eloquently put it, the British rule has been here for 150 years and more and they have not done much for the amelioration and uplift of the depressed classes. As he has pointed out within the scope allowed to the reformed councils we have done something to ameliorate their conditions by sinking wells, by opening schools wherever possible, enforcing their admission into the caste children schools and by appointing them as members of the local bodies. I believe that because that our people have been treating these brethren of the depressed classes in a manner, not worthy of them, in every way unworthy of the religion they profess to follow, they have lost their liberty in their own country, and they are held so low in the estimation of the world. I am afraid the same process is going on in the British Empire. (Hear, hear.) They are beginning to treat us Indians, not only here, but in the Colonies also, as we have been treating the depressed classes, as ' Pariahs '. I think we have been served right (Hear, hear). But we are awakening to the wrongs that we have done to our poor depressed classes. The caste people have thrived at the expense of the depressed classes. They have been labouring for centuries, and the caste people have been enjoying the fruit of their hard labour all along. They have not been treated fairly and justly : that must be admitted. A similar process is going on in the treatment of Indians.

3-30
p.m.

" Well, in the Colonies as well as in India, Indian labour has been exploited by British capitalists, and the complaint is that the labourers are not given living wages. I have often referred to this in this Council when speaking of Assam labour.

" Now, you must have read of Agricola, the Roman Governor, who had done a great deal in civilizing Britain. He gave equal justice to the Britons

[Mr. P. Kesava Pillai]

[25th January 1928]

and to the Romans. He taught them to use baths, to learn letters and to clothe themselves (Dr. Mallayya : 'When?') when the Romans ruled Britain, I read it in the histories written by Englishmen. Yet this mighty Rome declined and fell because they lived on the labour of slaves—subject peoples, and they loved and enjoyed the blood sports of gladiators. Gladiators from distant Galacia fought with deadly weapons and bled to death to entertain Roman audiences. Now we find in Europe and in America a similar spirit of exploiting weaker people and enjoying blood sports. In Chicago the other day there was Dumpsey Tunnery fight. One hundred and fifty thousand people flocked to witness it, aeroplanes flew, special trains were run and 20 million dollars collected. Dumpsey in the ninth round was so brutally hammered that he bled in his eyes and mouth and yet civilised men, women and children enjoyed the sight. It indicates the decline and decay of the modern conquering and civilised people.

"I had the honour of moving the loyalty resolution in 1914 after the outbreak of the Great War (Hear, hear). I have got the resolution here, in this big book. I quoted Bhishma of the Mahabharata, who taught the rules of Dharma for the guidance of the kings to point a moral for our Government to follow. They then talked of our partnership in the Empire and we gladly contributed men and money. Even our prisoners were sent to Mesopotamia to serve the Army. His Majesty sent a loving message acknowledging the staunch loyalty and attachment of the people of India to the British throne in the great crisis. Lord Hardinge was our Viceroy, and his appeal had a rousing effect on the people. Then there was a real feeling of comradeship between the Britisher and the Indian. While referring to the Queen Victoria's Royal Proclamation of 1858 and to the spirit of treating it as a 'ceremonial paper', I said then—'However, the war is working a marvellous change in all our minds. True there are still some—as the *National Review* pointed out—who will not see that gibe that the educated classes do not speak for the masses has done duty long enough'. But cannot blame for they are without vision and the habit of sneering at the 'microscopic minority' has become rather too strong in them to be easily shaken off. We feel, however, that a great era of peace and good will dawn among men and mutual esteem and equal rights and citizenship will prevail among all the fellow subjects of His Majesty, and we share in your Excellency's hope and confidence that races which as comrades have fought side by side for the cause of honour, justice and all that civilization stands for, will pass on to later generations an understanding and comradeship which will survive when the horrors of war have passed away.'

"I have quoted this from the proceedings of the day and I will make a present of that speech to those who want to read it.

"Mr. President, Sir, we believed them and they believed us. There was such a fellowship and comradeship at the time that we were very pleased with ourselves, full of hopes for our future. Well, after the war ended. . . ." (Laughter.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member has already exceeded the time-limit."

* Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—"I will finish it in a few minutes."

25th January 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member will have to close his speech very speedily."

* Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Have I finished the fifteen minutes?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Ten minutes is the rule. You have exceeded it."

* Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Very well, I will finish it in one or two minutes. We say if some Indians had found a place on this Commission, it would have satisfied us. Without that, it looks rather as driving the iron very deep. That is the grievance. It would have been different even if my friend Mr. Siva Raj alone was appointed on the Commission (Loud laughter and cheers). Yes, it would have shown 'fraternity, equality and comradeship' and no other colour bar was meant. Parliament is the supreme authority. We do not question it. But it must have our co-operation, make us feel equal partners in the governance of our country. (Hear, hear.) That is what we want to express. It is said in Tamil—I think you know Tamil enough, Mr. President, Sir; at any rate my Friend the hon. Mr. Marjoribanks knows it—The proverb is:

வாய் வாழைப்பழம்,
கை கர்ணககிழங்கு.

(Laughter.) It means sweet is the word of the mouth as the plantain fruit and irritating is the gift of the hand as the acrid yam."

"To put it in an English garb it was all honey pot then, and now, it is all pepper box. (Laughter.)

"I would appeal to the representatives of the British race and of the British Government to soothe the feelings of a disappointed people and not to allow them to grow into exasperation. I am getting old and I may not feel it so bitterly as my young friends in the House, over this deliberate exclusion of Indians. British statesmen with 'high vision' should not allow things to drift to disastrous results."

* Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—"Mr. President, Sir, as I was listening to the speech of Mr. Slater, I was reminded of a chapter in the history of Canada. I refer to the history of Canada between the years 1820 and 1850. The happenings in Canada in those days provide an exact parallel to the happenings in India to-day. Canada as you know was inhabited by people of different races and different religions. In those days there were feuds going on, religious as well as racial. Canada was then being governed by the English bureaucracy which was called 'family compact'. It was a nickname given to British officials governing Canada in those days. Canada was then peopled by different races—Englishmen, Scotch, French and other races as well as West Indians. When the people wanted responsible Government the plea put forward by the bureaucracy of Canada was that if the supremacy of Britain was removed the people would all quarrel and cut their own throats as there was no homogeneity among the people of Canada. That was how the domination of Canada by the British was tried to be justified.

"We find exactly the same thing here. There were no doubt several 3-45
revolutions and riots and they had to be suppressed by the strong arm of the p.m.
British. Still the people wanted responsible Government. There were also legislative assemblies then. But the British Parliament gave power to the

[Mr. D. Narayana Raju] [25th January 1928]

executive in Canada, to overrule the decisions of the legislatures. In those days there were parties known as 'Patriots' party' and so on. Of course the British followed a policy similar to that followed by the bureaucracy in India now. Their policy was mercy to the mean and blows to the brave, just as it is in India to-day. But on account of the strong feeling of the people of Canada the British yielded at last and gave them responsible Government. What do we find in Canada now? There is peace and amity since responsible Government was given, and the country progressed in all directions very rapidly and beyond all forecasts.

"Now, Sir, here in the institution of the Simon Commission, the British imperialists claim that Parliament should be solely responsible for shaping India's destiny. India rises in protest against this arrogance and conceit. The whole country protests against the British being the sole arbiters of the destinies of India. England is ill-fitted to undertake any such charge. Look to the happenings of our own days. What is the behaviour of England towards democratic movements. When there was a popular party movement in Russia who stood in its way? It was Britain. Take the case of Turkey. When the Sultan was overruled by a popular Government in Turkey, there was the shaking of the manes of the British Lion and the showing of its gory claws. Kemal Pasha stood firm. The British Lion thought that discretion was the better part of valour and receded. Again in China, the Chinese people are fighting for liberty and want to throw out the foreign domination. Who is the arch conspirator that wanted to keep them down? It is England. So we find that England is the arch enemy of all popular movements in the world. Coming nearer home to the British dominions themselves, America had to wage a war of independence to get away from the clutches of England. Canada has to struggle and struggle hard before she can get away from British domination. It is the same story also in the case of Ireland. We have known cases of animals living upon their own progeny. But among human races, we find only the English people who want to live at the expense of their own colonies and their subjects. Those are facts. Therefore it is but right that India should protest against the shaping of her destinies by England. English people even in their own interests, must change their methods and adapt them to the recent world movements. The question before England now is either to have a satisfied India or to have a discontented and dissatisfied India."

* V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Sir, I think it a sacred duty to oppose the resolution in its amended form. Let no Member of any of the existing parties in this hon. House think for a moment that I do so with a view to getting any favour from the Government or other political parties, but I do so because of a clear mandate from the depressed communities taking into account their appalling condition existing to-day. Let no Member think that we sitting on this side of the House representing the depressed classes are men devoid of patriotism or take a fancy to co-operate with the Simon Commission in its present form.

"We have abundant reasons to show that the conditions under which the depressed classes labour to-day warrant a Commission purely non-communal and who are not interested in any particular political party in India.

"Secondly, in the preamble to the India Act of 1919 it is stated a 'parliamentary commission' and not a mixed Commission.

25th January 1928] [Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai]

"In a country composed of people of varying castes, creed and religion and having a sixth of the population under perpetual subjection under the yoke of caste oppression, no wise statesman will lend his ears for a mixed Commission. In days gone by the so-called superior castes constituted themselves as the Imperial patriarchs of the nation and, in order that they might easily and comfortably live upon the rest, very cleverly invented the most demoralizing and degenerating system of caste. Under this system, against the sacred Law of God and man, the depressed classes were taught to believe themselves as the natural serfs of the hierarchy. Even since this mighty fraud was invented, the depressed classes were kept as slaves while other communities flourished without strain or labour. Under this magical hallucination, generations have come and gone and, as the unaltered laws of the Universe will have it, our India with all her boasted glories and traditions has fallen from her high position and is now sunken in calamity and misery. But in spite of it, without caring to find out the real cause of the national disease, the shattered and disintegrated remnants of the old hierarchy are now raising the wild and frantic outcries for political equality and national independence. What assurance is there that the interests of the depressed classes will be safeguarded if a mixed Commission is chosen? The original resolution is to a certain extent inconsistent with what fell from the lips of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The latter said that in framing a constitution on National lines, the interests of the depressed communities will be considered but the original resolution contemplated a Round Table Conference of delegates elected by members of the legislatures in India. The Mover must be aware that no member of the depressed classes have come to these Councils with an 'election' ticket and if the resolution was accepted it would mean that none of our representatives would have any voice in choosing delegates for such a Conference.

"Some of the other speakers indulged in appealing to the depressed class members not to stand aloof. I am not justified in co-operating with such parties who are dissatisfied with the Commission. I may tell Mr. Goenka that he has not practically seen the disabilities of the depressed classes in the rural parts.

"Moreover, I had the opportunity of presiding over a few depressed class conferences in the mufassal and unanimous resolutions were passed expressing satisfaction with the Simon Commission and a desire to co-operate with it in all its stages. So I have a clear mandate from the depressed communities to shun this resolution.

"So long as the mentality of the Indians is what it is now, India cannot and will not have Swaraj, and by boycotting the Commission Swaraj will not fall from heaven. For instance, when the election of the Deputy President was on, some of the prominent members were eager to see a depressed class member in that position. When all important members of all the parties joined together, it went to an hon. Member but he did not like to have it when a member of the depressed communities aspired for it. Even yesterday, when a modest request was made in this House for an efficient staff for the amelioration work of the depressed classes, it was negatived. (Mr. Satyamurti: By whom? Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai replied: Because you were not here.) How long are we to live on hopes from other communities? Let us have something in practice.

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai] [25th January 1928]

"Had it not been for the Britisher I may say boldly the depressed communities would not have come to the present position. We have no quarrel with the Simon Commission.

"My hon. Friend, Mr. Hamid Khan, was appealing to us to join in the boycott. Recently I had the opportunity of visiting Malabar and was greatly surprised to see even Mappilla gentlemen objecting to Adi-Dravidas and other depressed communities passing through the public roads with decent umbrellas and coloured clothes. (Voices: No, no.) I saw it personally.

"In these circumstances, I strongly oppose the resolution."

* Rao Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I had no idea of speaking on this resolution this afternoon, but I am prompted to speak on account of the congratulations offered by the hon. Mr. Slater to Mr. Siva Raj and members of his ilk. If the members of the depressed classes had been kept oppressed, I ask who is responsible for such oppression and suppression all these years? (A voice: Government) In spite of the existence of a benign Government, in spite of the legislatures having had official or nominated majority for over half a century, if the depressed classes think that they still continue to be oppressed by others, I ask them whether it is the Government that is responsible for all this oppression or the people? (Hear, hear.) When the Government give an European jury to try an European, if they had only cared for the advancement of the low and depressed classes, why did they not make necessary provision to improve the condition of the depressed classes, or for the matter of that, any other community? Why should the blame be thrown on the people and not on the Government? Sir, the hon. Mr. Muniswami Pillai has spoken just now, about the sufferings they are undergoing in Malabar. I am reminded of an occurrence which took place in Palghat. Three years ago, the members of the depressed classes were prevented from entering the Agraharam street in Palghat. What had the benign Government done then? On whom was notice under section 144 served? Was it on the members of the higher classes or on the depressed classes? (Hear, hear.) In the circumstances, Sir, I beseech the members of the depressed classes to vote for the proposition. Or let them by all means co-operate with the Commission, but let them say that more than the so-called higher classes the Government of the country is responsible for their bad lot all these years."

4 p.m.

* Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to speak as a representative of the Indian Christian community, which though highly advanced in education, is not so much advanced in political matters. All the same I support this amended resolution heartily. Now what is the Catholic idea which is very clearly defined as to self-determination in regard to Government? The Catholic idea was carried to its logical consequence by all the Republics and the parliamentary governments that sprung up in Italy and other parts of Europe during the so-called Dark Ages. The idea is that Government depends upon the good will and consent of the people—*vox populi* (voice of the people). In carrying out that idea, the Anglo-Saxon people under the leadership of Simon de Montfort fought against the Norman kings and got a parliament. I think our position to-day is analogous to that. It was during the Catholic times that the British established a parliament. It was in the year 1298, in the 13th century. And soon afterwards in the 14th century that parliament obtained the power of the purse,

25th January 1928]

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

the power of legislation and the power of censuring the ministers. I challenge whether that power has yet been obtained by our Toy Parliament. (Hear, hear.) One objection is raised to our right of self-determination and that is that there are so many centrifugal forces in operation against unity and a nationhood—different languages, different religions and so on. These, however, can be counteracted by certain unifying forces as has happened in some countries. Take the case of the United States of America. It consists of so many races, so many languages and also so many conflicting religions and still they have become one nation. They pride themselves as Americans. Are things worse in India? In Switzerland, the people are divided by so many geographical barriers, with so many divergent languages and religions and also races and customs. Yet they have got one national Government and all the people pride themselves as a Swiss nation. The differences and feuds between the Catholics and Protestants in Switzerland are much greater than those between the Hindus and the Muhammadans in India. They fought battles on account of religion even in the last century and in spite of that fact they have formed one nation.

“Much stress has been laid on the submerged millions in India, treated as untouchables. We have, however, to read the correct history of India about the Adi-Dravidas and the depressed classes in their relation to the higher classes. Some of my friends who have just spoken think they had become outlaws during pre-British times and that it is the British Government that has given them the protection of law and liberty. If, however, you read the history of the Mahrattas by Grant Duff and other authors, you will find that during the time of the Mahratta Empire at the advent of the British in Western and Central India the depressed classes had not less of liberty and protection of law than the British Government has given them. I think it is Justice Telang who pointed out that it was during the British times that the gulf between the depressed classes and the higher classes has increased. The British Government had not until recently done anything particularly for raising the condition of the depressed classes constitutionally. The way in which the education of the people was allowed to drift for itself by the British Government and the permanency and the rigidity given by British Courts to caste and custom to an extent never contemplated in Indian States, tended to raise the higher classes and lower the depressed classes. Their condition seems to me to have become worse than before. (Hear, hear.) In this southern presidency I don't think the British have done anything special to raise their condition until recently. It is the Depressed Class Missions established by some Hindu high-caste leaders that have done much more to elevate them, apart from what the foreign missionaries have effected in the same direction, than anything the British Government have tried to do until very recently. Now the British have been vying to give them something to show their great sympathy, only during the last few years. I ask my Adi-Dravida friends how the Statutory Commission is going to find ways and means to improve their condition without the good-will and co-operation of the higher classes? Our position is this: that whether we are Christians or not, we feel that we, as Indians, have been treated with contempt by the British in the way the Commission has been constituted and is to proceed. The Commission ought to have consisted wholly of Indians (hear, hear) or we should have an Indian Commission elected by our Legislatures to co-operate with the White one on an equal footing. That would

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

[25th January 1928]

be the proper solution of the difficulty and if instead of seven Englishmen the Commission had consisted of 9, 11, or 15 Indians, the depressed classes would have been represented on that Commission as well as other Hindus, Christians, Sikhs, etc. According to the provision made in the draft Reforms Bills drawn up by some of our leaders (Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar and Dr. Besant) with a joint electoral system the depressed classes would come in larger numbers on account of the reservation of seats for them, as well as Muhammadans, Christians, etc., more or less in proportion to population”

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—“ I move for a closure.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am not prepared to accept the closure at this stage.”

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ Mr. President, if time permitted I could myself say something about the depressed classes but confine myself to a few brief remarks. For example, I should like to put one question to the hon. Member who referred to a certain Agraharam. Who was it that prevented the depressed classes from entering that Agraharam? Through whose action was it that that question arose? It was certainly not through the action of any British official. My hon. Friend, Mr. Saldanha, is very fond of looking for a golden age. Yesterday he found one in the 14th century : to-day he has found another in the time of Sivaji. What use is it to the representatives of the depressed classes who sit behind there to tell them that several centuries ago, as his reading convinces him in the Mahratta country and under Sivaji they were treated with greater respect than they are now. It is not for a golden age in the past that the depressed classes are looking, it is for a golden age in the future (hear, hear), and they have made a straight statement that they are not convinced as yet of the determination of hon. Members opposite that they shall enjoy a golden age. Let me say after so much has been said as to what has been done by their fellow countrymen in this Presidency for the depressed classes that I speak of what I know: that while I have the greatest admiration for certain members of the higher caste Brahmans and others who have devoted time and money to fostering the interests of the depressed classes, these gentlemen have received exceedingly little support from the communities from which they came and that I aver without fear of contradiction. But, Sir, the hour is growing late and as Mr. Siva Rao has said the issues concerned with this resolution are at last clarified. He made I thought one of the most important contributions to our debate . . . and I may be excused if I cross the t-s and dot the i-s in what he said.

4-15
p.m.

“ If I venture to oppose this motion, Sir, it is because it seems to me most important that this House should realize what it is going to do if it accepts this resolution. There can be no doubt as to the position. I shall illustrate it if I may, by a few quotations :

‘ At the expiration of ten years after the passing of the Government of India Act, 1919, the Secretary of State with the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament shall submit for the approval of His Majesty the names of persons to act as a Commission for the purpose of this section.’

“ That, Sir, is a quotation from the Act to which this House owes its being,—the Act with reference to which it is open to hon. Members opposite to walk into this House and if they deem fit to walk out again (Laughter). The privilege this House enjoys to-day of debating this important question is

25th January 1928]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

derived from that Act, and whether hon. Members opposite like it or not they are bound by it and they are co-operating because they are taking the opportunity which the British Parliament has afforded them of being here to-day. And now, Sir, may I proceed with my quotations taken from this debate :

"Therefore it is that we are here to demand of the Government here and in England the right of the people in determining " their Government for themselves." " Until that right is conceded, until the constituted Assembly in India is able to dictate the constitution that is necessary for this country and is able to make the Parliament formally accept what the people of India decide is good for themselves, until that moment my party at any rate is bound not to co-operate with this Commission." . . . " We, who belong to the Congress party question the right of any other people or of any other nation to determine our constitution or the method in which we should progress ".

" That of course is in their belief the clear and logical position. I am not going to argue that position with them on its merits. But, I ask, when that is the declared position of members on the benches opposite, endorsed and re-endorsed by their leaders, by the hon. Member from Coimbatore, by Mr. Narayana Raju, why should there be now this pretence during the last two days that we are debating something else. It is to . . . "

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" . . . to annoy the Government."

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" . . . to cajole the people. ? This is an attempt to induce members on other benches to believe that in accepting the resolution now before the House they are accepting something quite different from what the intention and the underlying meaning of the resolution is according to its own authors. I do not quarrel with the position they have taken up. But what I do complain of is their lack of straightforwardness. (Swarajists) : Oh, Oh !)

" My hon. Friend, Mr. Kesava Pillai, referred to certain tendencies which in his opinion indicate a callousness in respect of human life. From whom, may I ask, have indications evidencing callousness in respect of human life come during this debate ? From the mover of the resolution. He delighted in using the term blood."

Mr. G. HAKISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" That is not unparliamentary " !

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" He is apparently prepared if need be to shed the blood of his fellow countrymen but I have no such desire.

" Then again, Sir, let us make clear the position. Much has been made by the mover of the original motion of the position taken up by Lord Birkenhead. One would think that Lord Birkenhead was the only person with whom we had to deal in this matter. If that remarkable man required any testimonial to the manner in which he has impressed himself upon other people's imaginations, then such testimonial can be amply found in our proceedings of the last few days. But this is not a matter in which we are dealing solely with Lord Birkenhead. We are dealing with a decision to which both Houses of Parliament and all the parties contained in that Parliament have subscribed.

" Well, Sir, let us now turn to the point of which so much has been made that this matter ought to be entirely left to certain people representing the various legislative bodies in this country. I can understand some Members of this House desiring that such a procedure should be regularized, but why

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[25th January 1928]

should the mover of the original resolution have played with us by saying that 'they do convey to His Excellency the Viceroy and His Majesty's Government the resentment of this Council at the appointment of the Statutory Commission and that they do advise His Majesty to abolish the constituted Commission and order the institution of a representative Round Table Conference to be composed of delegates elected by the elected members of all the legislatures of India?' That is the language possibly of constitutionalism! It admits that such a Round Table Conference can only be called by the authority of the Parliament but that authority they deny and what is there to prevent them themselves with the same liberty of acting under the same views that it is no one's concern but their own as to how the future affairs of this country are to be regulated—what is there to prevent them, I say, from calling and forming a Round Table Conference?"

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"Yes, they will do it."

(A voice.—"A convention Assembly.")

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"And, may I say that I am quite astonished that on such sound arguments as he used, Mr. P. Siva Rao should come to the conclusion that he is determined to support this resolution: (several voices: Hear, hear). Let me say that I do hope that it is perfectly clear to him and to every other Member what he will be voting for when voting for this resolution moved by the Member opposite."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is requested to bring his remarks to a close soon."

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"Yes, Sir, I shall do so. I would make this appeal to those who desire that this momentous question should be settled in the best interests of India. They know perfectly well that a settlement is most improbable—I might say, impossible—without the co-operation and the good will of the Parliament. How can members who know that of whatever divergent views they may be assist to pass the resolution now before the House? Do they think that if they do so the best interests of the country will be served or that that satisfactory solution which they and all of us desire will be brought any nearer? For my part, I refuse to believe it and propose to cast my vote against the motion now before the House."

* Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Sir, I wish to raise a point of order. The hon. Mr. Moir, I think, said I cannot"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think that it is a point of order."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, that the hon. the Finance Member, who has just broken the seal of silence which the Government have wisely set upon their lips should have used as his first argument the unfortunate 'Depressed Classes' shows the extreme limits to which the Government has been reduced in trying to invent arguments against this very reasonable proposition. I do not want to say anything which may offend the so-called 'Depressed Class'; but I would say to them in all humility and sincerity that sixty millions of Indians have their salvation in their own hands and in co-operating with their fellow countrymen, and not in a Government which is interested in keeping these classes as distinct from the higher classes in order that they may exploit the differences. Otherwise, I ask them, how is

25th January 1928]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

it that for the last 175 years of autocratic and bureaucratic rule, they have done next to nothing for the depressed classes? My hon. Friend, Mr. Sahajananda Swami, in a speech he delivered at the Gokhale Hall, admitted publicly that the British Government have woefully failed in doing its duty by the depressed classes. It is all very well for my hon. Friend, the Labour Commissioner, on Rs. 2,000 a month, I take it, telling us with a great sense of philanthropy, that these depressed classes should not boycott the Commission. If there is any other Government and if he is paid Rs. 2,000 a month, then also he will equally vehemently and eloquently speak against the depressed classes! These are the Civilians of a disciplined service. Therefore, I ask my hon. Friends of the depressed classes to tell my hon. Friend, 'Get thee behind us.' I think they have their salvation in their own hands. Will they decline to co-operate with their own brethren in this country? I have no doubt that they will come by their own only under a Swaraj Government, and not a foreign Government.

"Then, Sir, the hon. the Finance Member spoke with his accustomed fury of the demand of this side of the House that we should"

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"May I explain, Sir, that I was merely trying to make myself audible to the House by means of this instrument (the loud speaker)."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I accept the correction, Sir. I am glad to learn that my hon. Friend was not furious. (Laughter.) Let me proceed with my point. He was aghast, scandalized by the very idea of any Member of this House—a mere member of a subject race, which his countrymen have conquered, getting up and saying, 'We will make the Parliament accept our constitution.' A man, much greater than he or I, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannermann, said, when he was the Premier and piloting the South African Union Bill in the House of Commons, and when Members of the Opposition wanted to move several amendments: 'I will accept no amendment whatever. This Bill has come from South Africa, and I will not have a comma or a semi-colon altered.' I know, however, that the Boers had to fight the Britishers and defeat them before they got their demand, and we too may have to do it. But, in the meantime, we may remember that nothing is ever given to any nation voluntarily by its rulers, nor its right to swaraj or its right to self-government ever recognized except at the point of the bayonet by the British. As for that, let Canada answer; let South Africa answer; let New Zealand answer; and last but not least, let the United States of America answer. That is so far as this point is concerned.

"Then he asked us, 'Why all this cajoling if you are straight for self-determination and have no use for the British Parliament. Why do you accept amendments? Why do you make speeches?' Exactly. We are paying my hon. Friend in his own coin. May I ask this Government why they remained neutral on my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar's amendment? Have they no opinions on that matter? Do they want the powers of the Committee to be changed? They played a trick. They wanted if possible to water down our amendment by getting the other amendment passed somehow. We have learned this game from them and we can also play it. We will (laughter), go on defeating them until we send them home.

4-30 p.m.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[25th January 1928]

"Then we are told that my hon. Friend, Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao, revelled in blood. He is a very peaceful man. This might be said of the country which shed much blood in Jallianwalla Bagh and in the Mappilla tragedy and that is the country from which my hon. Friend comes. The blood is on his hand, not on mine.

"He says: 'Does Lord Birkenhead alone count'? Yes: not the Finance Member of the Government of Madras, though he is the hon. Mr. Moir, because he is His Majesty's Secretary of State for India. His motion was accepted unanimously in both Houses and His Majesty's Royal Warrant of Appointment of the Commission carries out what he wants. Therefore, unless my hon. Friend retires, goes to England, enters Parliament and becomes the Secretary of State, he will excuse us, if we cannot take him seriously.

"Then he asks us, 'What is there to prevent my hon. Friend holding a Round Table Conference.' Nothing. On the 12th February we are holding it and my hon. Friend is welcome there to help us, if he means what he says. But what prevents us now is the British bayonets which my hon. Friend represents here. He represents no reasons, no arguments, no logic and no sentiments except the British poison gas, the British bayonet and it is these which make him laugh all the time. They know we can only speak now. But I want him to remember that he laughs best who laughs last. You can play with a nation once too often. You can trifle with a nation too long. I think the time has come when my hon. Friend's countrymen must realize that the patience of this nation is getting rapidly exhausted.

"Then he finally said, 'I have no desire to appeal to my hon. Friends opposite'. I am very glad at that compliment. I congratulate myself and the members of my Party that we have earned this very good certificate from my hon. Friend that so far as we are concerned the charm of his siren voice is gone, and he must seek fresh fields and pastures new in order still to go on making the people of this country imagine that they can get water out of stone. I have no doubt his appeal has fallen on deaf ears of my hon. Friend from Bellary.

"But what rankles in our breast, Mr. President, is Lord Birkenhead's insolent speeches, his reference to the dissensions in the country and his contemptuous reference to us, which only a proud member of an arrogant race, too proud of its power and too unmindful of the sensibilities of another nation, can make. And we feel it is an insult, and that is why we say that if Lord Birkenhead asks us 'Do you want the British army and British navy to be withdrawn from India?' at a round table conference, we are willing to discuss the matter. But if he is going to insolently challenge us 'Do you want us to withdraw?' we will say 'Yes'. We will dare. We have no enemies in the world. England has no friends. Go to France, go to Germany, Afghanistan, China; go anywhere, the name of your country stinks in the nostrils of the people of the world. (At this stage there was loud cheering by some occupants of the President's gallery). Yet you are the people to fight us."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. The gentlemen who applauded in the President's gallery should retire at once.

"As nobody went out, the President ordered that the entire gallery should be cleared off which was accordingly done."

25th January 1928]

* **Mr. S. SATYAMURTI** :—"Sir, the last argument I want to advance in favour of this motion is that the acceptance of this Commission means the voluntary acquiescence by Indians in their domination by another people. I grant that to-day we are unable to fight. To-morrow we may; but why should we voluntarily acquiesce in a Commission which brands us as political slaves fit only to accept crumbs from the table of Sir John Simon and Company? Thank God, there is wonderful unanimity of opinion on this matter. I hope that in spite of a few dissentient voices, the voice of this House will go forth as the opinion of this Province that Sir John Simon and his Colleagues are not wanted in India, and least of all, in Madras.

"Sir, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, the Premier of Great Britain, concluded a very important speech on this matter, with a quotation from Milton. He said: 'If God wants a particularly hard thing to be done, he tells it to his Englishman.' I know the Englishman's self-complacency. But even I was surprised at this presumptuous statement of an Englishman whose country has sent to us a Clive, a Warran Hastings, a General Neill, a General Dyer and the authors of the Mappilla tragedy; the statement seems to be particularly blasphemous.

"Lord Birkenhead when he was asked what he will do if the Indians boycott the Commission, replied that 'they will not dare.' We have dared. This Council has dared. Practically all the elected members who represent constituencies in this House have dared. Let His Lordship do what he dares. He once said 'He either fears his fate too much or his deserts are small, who dare not put it to the touch to win or lose it all.' We have faith in ourselves; we have faith in our destiny of our country; we have faith in God. And therefore, we do not fear our fate too much. Our deserts are not small. We dare put it to the touch to win or lose it all, believing that India's right will triumph over the might of Great Britain. I ask hon. Members to support this motion."

* **The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS** :—"Mr. President, Sir, the resolution in its final form seeks to express the view of the Council that it has no confidence in, and will have nothing to do with, the Simon Commission as it is at present constituted. I do not propose to go into the many questions that have been debated, but will confine myself to a few remarks on the scope of the resolution. There is considerable difference of view in the speeches made in favour of this motion. One considerable section of the House proceeded on the ground of self-determination. Even taking that view, I find it very difficult to understand why it should preclude discussion of the subject with the Commission. Presumably these members contemplate that the constitution that may result from their self-determination will be implemented by an Act of Parliament: and if this be the case, why not discuss this matter with the Parliamentary delegation. In the case of other countries like Ireland, Canada, etc., such Acts have been passed after months and even years of discussion and negotiation. Further, from the point of view of self-determination, I cannot see that the present constitution of the Commission, on which the motion lays stress is relevant. In the view of others who have spoken in favour of the resolution there is dissatisfaction because they consider that they have not yet had sufficient assurances that the proposed Legislative Committees will have an effective voice in the shaping of the various problems which the Commission will consider. There again I do not understand why people who think thus